


Maryland
rC
107
.M32
no.334
Folio

UNIV. OF MD. COLLEGE PARK



3 1430 00294412 4



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
Lyrasis Members and Sloan Foundation

07
32
334
olio

THE FINAL REPORT OF THE

*Human Services
Planning &
Coordination
Project*

Maryland Department of State Planning

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND LIBRARY

THE FINAL REPORT OF THE HUMAN SERVICES PLANNING AND COORDINATION PROJECT

Maryland
HC
137
-1102
51.334
Telis

FEBRUARY 1978

MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF STATE PLANNING

1157696

HONORABLE BLAIR LEE III
Acting Governor of the State of Maryland

VLADIMIR A. WAHBE
Secretary, Department of State Planning

EDWIN L. THOMAS, Director
Comprehensive State Planning Division

CLARENCE J. HARRIS, Chief
Human Resources Section

STATE PLANNING COMMISSION

Mr. Saul I. Stern, Chairman
Delegate John R. Hargreaves
Senator Julian Lapidus
Mr. Edward W. Cooley
Mrs. Margaret D. Irvin
Mr. Arnold M. Kronstadt
Mr. Carlton R. Sickles
Mr. Michael W. Skinner

Prepared by Gay M. Gross
with the assistance of
Ruthe Epstein, Project Coordinator
and

Mary Abrams
Calvin Blinder
Steve Girton
Sue Gladhill
William Houck

Michael Maione
Paul Peterson
Judy Sachwald
George Sakkal
Alison Witow

Cover design and production assistance: Ardis Welch

Secretarial assistance provided by
Pat Harper, Fran Marchlinus, and Celeste Ratti

Publication No. 334

The Human Services Planning and Coordination Project could not have happened without the active involvement of many people within Maryland State Government. While too countless to individually mention, the advice and support these individuals provided is greatly appreciated.

The preparation of this report is part of the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project which was financed through a Planning Assistance Grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare administered by the Maryland Department of State Planning.



MARYLAND
DEPARTMENT OF STATE PLANNING

301 WEST PRESTON STREET
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21201
TELEPHONE: 301-383-2451

VLADIMIR A. WAHBE
SECRETARY OF STATE PLANNING

MARVIN MANDEL
GOVERNOR

Dear Reader:

We are pleased to provide you with the Final Report of the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project. This Final Report fully describes the Project's background and history, each of its work elements, its major accomplishments, and the lessons learned during the three years of the Project. For your information, a Summary Report has also been prepared. It contains the same material as the Full Report but it is more brief in length and detail. You will notice that that Summary is also the first chapter of the Full Report. Separately bound copies of the Summary are available; please feel free to request that Summary if you feel it will better meet your needs.

This Final Report is a case study of the Project and emphasizes those activities which were successful and demonstrated a potential of transferability to others interested in comprehensive human services planning. We have also reviewed the techniques and processes which were undertaken during the Project in the hope that this will prove valuable to others considering the initiation of similar activities. The Report is organized around the following headings: Interagency Planning and Coordination Activities; Technical Assistance to State, Regional and Local Agencies; Issue Papers; and Analysis of Needs and Conditions. These headings reflect the major activities of the Project. Chapters on Project initiation, management and evaluation, and Project accomplishments and lessons are also included.

The Human Services Planning and Coordination Project was supported by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare for three years under its Partnership Program. Both their financial support and helpful guidance throughout the Project are sincerely appreciated. It is important to note that many of the initiatives undertaken during the Project are now firmly in place and are being continued. The Human Services Planning and Coordination Project has proven to be far more than just a demonstration.

Many valuable products and improvements in State planning occurred as a result of the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project. This Final Report will help you to better understand those efforts. We hope that you will find this Report both informative and valuable to your own work.

-2-

Please do not hesitate to be in contact with us if you desire a copy of any of the Project's publications or additional information.

Sincerely,



Vladimir Wahbe

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTER</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
I	Executive Summary	1
	Introduction	1
	Purpose of the Report	3
	Project Overview	4
	Project Reports and Publications	33
	Project Timeline	34
II	Background and Project Initiation	35
	Staffing	41
	Cabinet Meeting	43
	Report on Present Status and Future Directions	44
III	Coordination Activities	46
	Interagency Planning Activities	47
	Legislative Liaison	50
	Human Services Task Force	53
	Human Services Council	56
IV	Planning and Technical Assistance Available to State Agencies	59
	Executive Planning Process	59
	Department of Human Resources Placements	69
	Planning and Technical Assistance to State Agencies	80
V	Planning Assistance to Local and Regional Agencies	84
	Baltimore City Local Test	85
	Montgomery County	89
	Regional Planning Council	90
	Health and Welfare Council	92
	Cecil County	95
	A Guidebook for Human Resources Planning	104
VI	Issue Papers	108
	Deinstitutionalization: Problems and Opportunities	109
	Coordination in Human Services	116
	Purchase of Care	120
	Organizational Approaches to Serve the Needs of Special	
	Target Groups	126
	Transportation Disadvantaged	129
	Education-to-Work Linkages	132
VII	Analysis of Needs and Conditions	135
	Social Indicators	135
	Program Inventory	145
	Voluntary Sector	150

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CON'T)

<u>CHAPTER</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
VIII	Management and Evaluation	155
	Work Program, Progress Reports, and Evaluation	156
	Project Management	160
IX	Accomplishments and Lessons	171
	Project Accomplishments	171
	Lessons	178

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

During the early 1960's, little attention was devoted to social planning and the term "planning" was generally applied to physical land use considerations. This changed with the proliferation of social welfare grant-in-aid programs during the "Great Society" of the mid 60's. The large number of grant programs proposed during the "Great Society" helped focus on the need for social planning. Many of these new grant-in-aid programs were categorical in nature and were designed to meet specific social needs, e.g., child care services, rehabilitative services for the aged and disabled, education services to adults, etc. The majority of these categorical aid programs were administered by HEW. Elaborate funding mechanisms were created to distribute these grants and included state/local match requirements and complicated funding formulas.

Under the "New Federalism" of the 1970's, the need to strengthen management capabilities and the return of authority to the local level for the planning and delivery of services became the new planning tenets. This was the basic premise of the Allied Services Act which was submitted to Congress in 1972. Its purpose was to replace the categorical grant approach with a unified and coordinated human service delivery system. The Allied Services Act would allow State and local planning authorities to transfer funds between various HEW programs and would permit the waiver of cumbersome Federal requirements. A unique feature of this Act was the preparation by the States of an Allied Services Plan.

When the Allied Services Act became stymied in Congress, HEW developed several alternative programs with the similar intent of developing a coordinated human service delivery system. Services Integration Targets of Opportunity (SITO)

projects were designed to foster services integration. SITO projects encouraged states to recognize and consolidate service delivery programs into a single administrative structure. During the same period, many States created monolithic human resource departments which placed personal health, mental health, social services, and aging and youth programs all under one roof.

In contrast to the SITO program, the Partnership Program proposed by HEW was geared towards increasing the capacity of chief elected officials at all levels of government to plan, manage and deliver human services. Partnership Programs were considered to be more innovative than SITO projects and grants were provided for such activities as providing local planning assistance, providing additional Executive level staff, or for automating information and referral systems. One of the criteria of the Partnership Program was that the projects it supported would strive for comprehensiveness in their planning approach.

Fragmented and often unrelated social service programs were also creating management problems at the State and local levels. In Maryland prior to 1969, there were over 250 separate departments, agencies, boards and commissions. In an effort to streamline its governmental structure, Maryland State government was reorganized. Instead of a myriad of separate agencies, each with a single specific focus, a cabinet system of government was created with principal departments for planning, budgeting, health and mental hygiene, employment and social services, public safety and correctional services, education, and economic and community development.

Although this reorganization solved many of Maryland's problems, it did not entirely solve the problem of providing a framework for a coordinated human services delivery system. Improved human services planning would result in a system which would be more manageable and more accountable. The Maryland Department of

State Planning (DSP) applied to HEW for a Partnership Grant in 1973 for the purpose of improving the State's capacity to plan and manage human services.

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

Since Partnership grants were considered to be demonstrative in nature, HEW required, as a condition of grant awards, that a final report or case study be prepared on each Partnership Project. This case study would identify which project elements were successful and could be transferred to other grantees, States, regions or other interested jurisdictions. This case study was prepared to meet this requirement of HEW..

In this report, State Planning has tried to summarize the activities of the three years of the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project (HSP&CP). This case study describes the background and origins of the Project, its relationship to other DSP activities, and assesses the various work activities undertaken in accordance with the Project's goals. Successes and failures are discussed in order to assist other Partnership grantees (and other non-grantee jurisdictions) interested in developing human services planning techniques.

The report focuses on the processes and techniques of each Project activity rather than the findings or conclusions of these activities. If more information is desired about the content or recommendations of a particular report, DSP will gladly provide a copy of that report upon request. A list of all the reports, papers, and other documentary material prepared during the Project may be found at the end of this chapter.

Since the Project's processes and techniques were chosen for emphasis, the report is organized topically and not chronologically. Many work items were continued from year to year and it was decided to discuss each topic inclusively. The organizational format used for this report is the same format used in the

Project's annual work programs. A wide variety of activities were subsumed under the HSP&CP, and it was necessary to logically relate all of these activities. Most activities may be categorized under the three major headings of coordination, technical assistance to State and local agencies, and analysis of needs and conditions. In addition, the report has major chapters describing the Project's initiation, administration and management, and its accomplishments and outcomes.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Since it describes a three year planning effort, this report is quite lengthy. There may be readers who only desire a brief overview of the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project. There may also be readers who are interested in only one particular aspect of the Project. Due to the interrelatedness of the Project elements, it may be difficult to understand a single section without reading a general overview. Therefore, the following section was prepared as an executive summary of the case study. It summarizes and highlights all activities of the Project in a more concise manner than the full length report.

Background and Project Initiation

The Department of State Planning has a legislative mandate to coordinate the plans and programs of all agencies of State government and to prepare a State Development Plan. As originally envisioned, one element of the Development Plan would be a Human Resources Plan. The goals of the Human Resources Plan were twofold: (1) to assist executive and legislative decision makers in allocating the State's resources in as efficient and effective a manner as possible toward meeting the human service needs of Marylanders; and (2) to assist nongovernmental providers of human services to better serve their clients by providing a coordinative State planning process for human resources, and by providing access to data resources with which to identify needs, plan for service delivery and permit the

evaluation of service effectiveness. The Plan would address a major problem associated with human services planning and service delivery: the lack of coordination among the many public and private agencies engaged in the delivery of human services.

To accomplish these goals, the Plan would examine the State's present system of service delivery to determine program gaps and duplications. This examination would require the collection and analysis of large amounts of data and thus, it was necessary to develop a standardized framework for classifying this information. The Activity Sector/Target Population (AS/TP) Matrix was devised to meet this need.

Funds were requested from HEW for a Partnership Grant to implement the Human Resources Plan. DSP was successful in obtaining funds and the Project officially began in August 1974. In July of that year, a significant event occurred which resulted in refocusing the Plan. DSP was invited to present the concept of the Human Resources Plan to the Governor's Cabinet. This was a unique opportunity which allowed for input into the HEW Partnership Project by the Governor and the Secretaries of the major human services departments. Comments made by Cabinet members plus a realization of the Plan's overly ambitious goals reshaped DSP's concept of the Project. It was clear that more emphasis should be placed on coordination activities that would assist agencies to improve their human service planning capabilities. The advent of the State's long-range planning and budgeting system - the Executive Planning Process - served to obviate the need for a State human resources plan. Hence, the Human Resources Plan was renamed the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project (HSP&CP) to reflect this change.

Receipt of HEW monies allowed DSP to recruit several new staff members for the Human Resources Section. The Human Resources Section is a part of the Division of Comprehensive Planning within the Department of State Planning. The

Department also has five other major divisions, including: Research, Capital Improvements, State Clearinghouse, Local and Regional Planning, and General Administration.

Human Resources staff are functional planners in the areas of health, social services, education, criminal justice, manpower, and housing. HEW funds helped support this staff and provided funds for two additional positions -- a generalist planner and a planner responsible for coordinating the Executive Planning Process. An HSP&CP Coordinator was designated to monitor work activities and to serve as a liaison with HEW. Overall supervision was provided by the Division Director and the Chief of the Human Resources Section.

Coordination Activities

Due to its intangible nature, coordination may often prove frustratingly difficult to achieve. Nonetheless, the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project has improved interagency coordination. This has been accomplished through Human Resources staff's participation in a variety of ongoing activities such as serving on interagency committees or reviewing State and Federal legislation. Staff have also devoted efforts to two additional work items -- the Human Services Task Force and the Human Services Council.

Coordination is a two way street. DSP staff participate in various committees in order to become informed and aware of activities which may require closer coordination between or among State agencies. It was also necessary for other State and local agencies to become informed and involved in the activities of the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project. The creation of the Human Services Task Force was the mechanism that DSP employed to gain input and advice from other agencies into its own activities.

Participation on interagency committees offers the opportunity to educate others about the need for human services planning and inform them of relevant

DSP activities. Committee participation also provides a mechanism for DSP staff to become substantively involved in interagency activities. During the three years of the Project, staff have served on 42 different interagency groups. These committees included special task forces and small working groups, as well as major standing committees appointed by the Governor. Through experience gained during the course of the Project, staff have become more sophisticated in their committee participation. Committee participation by DSP staff also provided a broader perspective to discussions which were often focused on immediate needs. Staff also benefitted from learning about problems and concerns of service providers. This exchange of ideas was an important component in building mutual respect and also helped foster interagency cooperation.

Consistent with DSP's mandate to "provide information to and cooperate with the Maryland General Assembly or any of its Committees," DSP participated in and analyzed State legislative activities. The bulk of this work was centered on State legislative proposals (over 100 bills were reviewed last year) and consisted of preparing reviews, recommending Departmental positions, and presenting those opinions in written or oral comments. Project staff also reviewed and commented on proposed Federal bills, proposed rules and regulations appearing in the Federal Register and "proposed rules and regulations" to implement Maryland State laws. Several positive benefits have resulted from legislative liaison activity:

- (1) it has raised the visibility of human service planning in legislative proposals;
- (2) it has raised staff consciousness regarding human services problems and priorities from the Legislature's perspectives;
- (3) analyses of the types of bills introduced frequently have been a forewarning of emerging popular shifts in public policy;
- and (4) DSP assisted legislators in assessing the relative merits of human services legislation.

Coordination activities went beyond staff participation on committees and task forces and legislative liaison. It also included work with the Human Services

Task Force, a group of representatives from State and local agencies and the academic community. This Task Force was an outgrowth of a smaller group that had served in a review capacity during the development of the Human Resources Plan Study Design. During the initial stage of the HSP&CP, the Human Services Task Force was called upon to provide information on human services, review staff reports, and generally assist in Project work activities.

The Task Force continued to serve an extremely valuable function as a link between the Project and other major human service actors in the community. The purpose and activities of the Project were more clearly understood because of the Task Force, while at the same time the Human Resources Section benefitted from the guidance and expertise of the individual Task Force members.

However, by the end of 1975, interest in Task Force participation had waned. Many members were more interested in working on activities related to their specific areas of interest than advising on the overall progress of all of the Project's work elements. DSP had also begun using ad hoc advisory groups or panels of experts to assist in various work products. Thus, it was decided to substitute these more informal ad hoc groups for the Human Services Task Force. Although the Task Force is no longer a formal structure, members still serve as information contact points or agency liaisons. They have become the core of a human services network upon which the Department still relies.

The Human Services Council was an outgrowth of the Department's coordination and legislative review activities. Numerous bills are introduced in the General Assembly every year to create special agencies or offices to serve target groups such as children and youth, veterans, and the handicapped. If passed, these bills could result in the proliferation of State agencies and the restructuring of Maryland's system of functional organization of State government. Pressure to create special purpose agencies resulted largely from poor coordination between existing agencies. DSP proposed an alternative organization model to strengthen interagency coordination -- the Human Services Council.

As proposed, the Cabinet level Human Services Council would be composed of the Secretaries of the major human service departments and would be responsible for coordinating and integrating services and addressing issues which cross departmental lines. The Council proposal was submitted to the Governor and DSP staff worked with the Lt. Governor and Governor's Executive Staff to gain support. However, after a special meeting of the relevant Cabinet Secretaries, the Governor decided not to convene the Council. Instead, it was decided to establish working staff committees to address cross cutting issues and problems. These ad hoc committees have been established and Human Resources staff have usually been included as members.

Planning and Technical Assistance to State Agencies

The Project goal of improving the planning capacity of human service agencies has largely been realized. To assist in this capacity building effort, several types of technical assistance were provided to State agencies.

The growing need to improve Maryland's decision making process led to the development of the Executive Planning Process (EPP). During the Summer of 1973, the initial Project start-up period, the Legislature and Governor directed State agencies to develop long and short range Executive Plans. This coincided with the HSP&CP work element to develop a coordinative planning process, and these two objectives were melded together, with the Human Resources Section assuming a leadership role in EPP development.

The Department of State Planning and the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning were charged with implementing EPP, and as a first step, minimum guidelines for plan preparation and a Plan Element Outline were prepared for agencies to follow. Both long and short range components were included in the Plan Element Outline. The eight elements included were: (1) an executive

summary, (2) introduction, (3) goals, (4) conditions and trends, (5) objectives, (6) policies, (7) implementation, and (8) evaluation.

The review of Executive Plans is a joint responsibility of the Departments of State Planning and Budget and Fiscal Planning. DSP's reviews focus on the substantive nature of the Plans and search for areas of duplication between Plans and internal consistency of individual Plans. Both the Human Resources Section and the Capital Improvement Division of DSP are involved in these Plan reviews. The review process permits the multi-disciplinary HSP&CP staff to share knowledge of various plans and identify areas requiring coordination. Formal review letters are prepared and these are usually followed up with personal meetings.

After the first set of EPP's, it was clear that further guidance on plan preparation was needed. Thus, an EPP Guidance Manual was prepared to amplify the Plan Element Outline, define EPP terminology, describe long and short range planning, and discuss the planning process. Further guidance and technical assistance was provided through training seminars conducted by the Department of Personnel.

As a final aspect of this process, DSP has proposed that an Annual Executive Plan Report be prepared. This report would bring together in a consolidated manner the major issues and priorities expressed independently in each EPP.

Two major benefits have been derived from the Executive Planning Process. First, the level of management appreciation within State organizations has greatly increased and secondly, the HSP&CP goal of development of a coordinative planning process has been met.

DSP work in the Executive Planning Process involved technical assistance to meet a specific legislative and gubernatorial requirement. Another type of technical assistance was the provision of staff assistance to augment an agency's human service planning capabilities. To do this, a portion of the DSP Partner-

ship Grant was transferred to the Department of Human Resources (DHR) to aid in a more deliberate way their capacity building efforts. This transfer funded two placement planners to help DHR meet the following general goals: (1) to help with the application of planning techniques to its (DHR) own internal processes; (2) to serve as a liaison between DHR and the HSP&CP staff; and (3) to identify planning problems and their solutions which might assist other functional agencies. As originally envisioned, one planner would be hired for two years. However, after nine months, the first planner was promoted to a permanent position within DHR, so a second planner was hired to complete the placement.

The focus of the first year of the placement was to increase the capacity of local social services departments to participate in and utilize existing DHR planning and evaluation instruments. Since three different planning processes were employed by DHR, the placement planner had to coordinate and integrate these systems so as to reduce planning requirements for local departments. This also involved providing technical assistance and training to the local Departments of Social Services to help build their planning and evaluation capacities.

The second placement planner concentrated on different areas of capacity building. This planner emphasized (1) providing technical assistance to State level personnel; (2) improving two areas of the planning process -- data development and needs assessment; and (3) participating in research and evaluation projects. To accomplish this, the second planner worked on a variety of projects including developing the needs assessment portion of the Title XX Plan; evaluating the Cecil County Planning Task Force as a possible model for obtaining local input into DHR's planning process; assisting in the development of field assessments local social services offices; assisting in the review of the Baltimore City day care model; and serving as a resource person for DHR on data needs and data sources.

Both DHR and DSP agree that accomplishments have been made in the areas that the HSP&CP was designed to improve, namely, planning coordination and capacity building. The special planning relationship and close cooperation between the two agencies will continue and plans have already been formulated to continue working on several projects.

In addition to the specified type of planning assistance discussed above, staff also provided technical assistance of a more general nature. This included reviewing human service plans, performing A-95 and surplus land reviews, analyzing capital facilities projects and master facilities plans and responding to individual requests for information.

Planning Assistance to Local and Regional Agencies

During the three years of the HSP&CP, staff worked with several of Maryland's counties and other planning bodies for the purpose of assisting them in their development of comprehensive human services planning capabilities, but particular attention was given to Baltimore City, Montgomery County, the Regional Planning Council, the Central Maryland Health and Welfare Council, and Cecil County. Local planning assistance became a high priority during the second and third years of the Project. A Guidebook for Human Resources Planning was prepared to reflect this priority status and to further increase DSP's assistance to counties.

An overall goal of the HSP&CP was to develop planning techniques and work products which were transferrable between the State and its localities. Therefore, at the very beginning of the Project, it was decided to test the planning concepts of the Project at the local level. Due to its interest in human services planning, Baltimore City Planning Department was selected to test several HSP&CP concepts, particularly the Activity Sector/Target Population (AS/TP) matrix, by preparing five specific reports on: (1) "Day Care in Baltimore," (2) "Primary

Health Services for Pre-School Children," (3) "The Relationship between Health Services and Day Care Centers," (4) "Start-Up Costs of Operating a Primary Care Health Center," and (5) "Planning Process Recommendations."

As a result of these studies, the City Planning Department concluded that the AS/TP concept was a valid one. The Baltimore City Planning Department discovered in the course of this work that a needs assessment methodology was also necessary for their work. One of the most successful outcomes of the Baltimore City local test was that it provided an impetus for the City to apply for its own Partnership Grant to develop a more detailed system to inventory and analyze human services.

Montgomery County also developed a system to inventory and analyze human services. The County's Office of Human Resources was interested in developing a local resource allocation mechanism as a basis for planning and budgeting decisions regarding the provision of human services. In order to do this, the County adapted the AS/TP matrix. There is now an ongoing cooperative relationship between DSP and the Montgomery County Office of Human Resources, and staff exchange information on the progress of their efforts to inventory services.

Technical assistance provided to the Regional Planning Council (an areawide planning agency representing the Baltimore Metropolitan Area) was primarily to advise and review their various planning outputs relating to human services. This included review of regional plans in several functional planning areas and review of their General Development Plan.

Like Baltimore City, the Health and Welfare Council was active in human resources planning in the region. The Council, in cooperation with the City, also became involved in developing a human services classification scheme. The Baltimore Area Services Identification System (BASIS) classifies services in a more detailed manner than does AS/TP. Staff reviewed drafts of BASIS and still continue to work with the Health and Welfare Council to coordinate the two systems.

The Health and Welfare Council also engaged in another project related to the HSP&CP. The Council periodically publishes a directory of all public and private human services offered throughout the State. A vast amount of data is collected for this which is known as the State Resource File. DSP recognized the compatibility of the Resource File with its Inventory of State Administered Human Service Programs. Consideration is now being given to assisting the Health and Welfare Council in automating the file which DSP would then utilize for the analysis of service gaps and duplications.

Since July 1975, the Department of State Planning has been supporting the work of the Human Services Planning Task Force of the Cecil County Council of Social Agencies through the provision of direct technical assistance and planning guidance. The Planning Task Force was created to promote interagency planning towards the development of a coordinated planning process for human services in the County. Specific work objectives of the Task Force include: (1) building a stronger commitment to human services planning within Cecil County; (2) designing ways of strengthening and maintaining relationships among different agencies and with other sectors of the community; (3) developing alternative ways of coordinating volunteer activities throughout the County; (4) identifying and implementing methods for continuously assessing the needs of County residents; and (5) increasing understanding of and access to new resources for the delivery of human services.

DSP aided the Cecil County Task Force by assisting in the design of the planning process, reviewing the inventory of County human services, suggesting alternative long and short range strategies for future actions, and by actually providing financial assistance for staff support. The DHR placement planner also participated in the Task Force to help with a County needs assessment and to develop a strategy for local input into the DHR Title XX Plan.

The idea of producing a guide book that could assist local jurisdictions in initiating a comprehensive human resources plan was a direct outgrowth of the Department's role in the Cecil County project. The Department wanted to interest other counties in comprehensive human services planning. To do this, it was decided to prepare a guidebook which would present basic planning guidance. The guidebook (which will be available in May 1978) explains why a county should become interested in comprehensive human resources planning; it delineates the roles and responsibilities of the various participants in the planning process; outlines the basic steps of the planning process; and highlights present planning efforts in selected Maryland counties. Follow-up efforts to the publication of the manual will include informing the Department's regional planners of its benefits, providing short term technical assistance to interested jurisdictions, providing indepth additional material related to human services planning, and possibly conducting specialized training sessions.

Issue Papers

The preparation of indepth studies on issues of special concern was, and continues to be, a major focus of the HSP&CP. Issue papers address topics which are interagency in nature, are of Statewide rather than local concern, and are considered to be priority issues. During the Project, six issue papers were prepared on the subjects of deinstitutionalization, coordination, purchase of care, target group agencies, the transportation disadvantaged and education-to-work linkages.

The Human Services Task Force specified deinstitutionalization (DI) as one of the first topics to be addressed in an issue paper. Thirteen different State agencies were involved in DI and the General Accounting Office had also selected Maryland as a case study to examine Federal programs and problems which hampered the States in accomplishing deinstitutionalization.

Research efforts consisted of reviewing and analyzing all Executive Plans of State agencies involved in DI and interviewing private group home operators, county planning officials and State agency representatives to determine State and local deinstitutionalization policies. An advisory committee was also convened to gain further input and to assist DSP in reviewing the report. Included in the report was a listing of all community residential facilities. The location of these facilities was mapped to show the co-location or absence of community facilities. Another significant activity in preparing the DI issue paper was State Planning's testimony to a Legislative Committee on the report's preliminary findings.

The draft report was widely circulated in order to correct any inaccuracies or deficiencies. In June 1976, the final report, Deinstitutionalization: Problems and Opportunities, was published and distributed. The report discussed deinstitutionalization in Maryland, administrative and policy issues, financial problems, the lack of supportive services, and community issues. The major recommendation was the need to develop coordinative mechanisms at the Executive, program and local levels.

Follow-up activities were directed towards development of an Executive level task force to promote interagency coordination. DSP is now participating on such a task force, which is focusing on mental health support systems. Future activities may include preparing a model community residences zoning ordinance and providing technical assistance to local jurisdictions in developing community residence plans. Overall, the feedback regarding the DI report was quite favorable and this report has become the basic reference document on deinstitutionalization activities in Maryland.

The issue of coordination in human services was also a topic selected by the Human Services Task Force for indepth study. The purpose of the paper was

to delineate the need for services coordination and to examine existing coordinating organizations. The coordination paper also reviews current literature to determine the theoretical basis of the need for coordination.

The paper, which will be released shortly, presents major guidelines for coordination based on the experiences of several case studies of coordinating agencies in Maryland. It is hoped that these guidelines will be applied to actual coordination functions in order to increase their effectiveness. Future plans for the utilization of this report include planning a seminar in conjunction with the Maryland Management Development Center on developing and strengthening coordination techniques and providing short term guidance on this subject to agencies requesting assistance.

In response to a Legislative request, DSP in conjunction with the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning studied the purchase of care system for residential services for juveniles. Purchase of care was an area where enhanced coordination was imperative since several agencies were using different criteria to administer the same program. The study closely reviewed the Juvenile Services Administration and the Social Services Administration because these two administrations were reimbursing private agencies at different rate levels for identical services. In addition, private group home operators were interviewed so that their perspective of the problem could be clearly identified.

The study answered several questions posed by the Legislature. In regard to the question of how much the State should pay, the paper recommended that the cost model delineated by the Social Services and Juvenile Services Administrations be used. However, this model should be regularly evaluated to determine its appropriateness. What special educational costs should be paid to private facilities with on-campus schools? The paper suggested that this was a policy to be decided by the Department of Education. The primary recommendation of the study

was the development of an interagency coordinating committee on residential services for children and youth. This recommendation has been adopted by the Governor's Committee on the Funding for Handicapped Children, and thus, it is likely to be implemented.

The issue paper on target group agencies also resulted from DSP's legislative responsibilities. Numerous legislative proposals had been introduced to create special purpose offices to serve the needs of the handicapped, children and youth, and veterans. The Office on Aging had been previously established by Executive Order. The Governor had also appointed a Special Task Force to Review the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of State Government. Despite all of this legislative and Executive interest in governmental organization, information was not available on the advantages and disadvantages of reorganizing State government along target group lines. This was what the report "Organizational Approaches to Serve the Needs of Special Target Groups" set out to study.

After an extensive review of public administration literature, three major themes emerged: (1) the impetus for governmental reorganization, (2) the nature and function of interest groups, and (3) an evaluation of the effectiveness of target group agencies. The discussion of these three points left the study inconclusive, since support for both organizational approaches was found. However, since Maryland had already selected a functional approach to government organization, the concluding chapter presented several strategies for improving the sensitivity of existing departments and agencies to the needs of special populations. The first draft of the target group paper was rather lengthy, and to avoid having the report become a "bookshelf" document, the study was condensed. The reduced version was distributed to interested agencies, legislators and the Governor's staff in March 1977.

The issue of coordination of limited transportation resources within the human services sector had been gaining attention for sometime at the local, State and Federal levels. It was important to know in what ways human needs and social programs are being impacted by the transportation sector.

During this paper's preparation, the Governor's Interagency Committee on Specialized Transportation had been formed to administer the Urban Mass Transportation Administration's Section 16(b)(2) program. (This program provides grants to non-profit groups for the purpose of or adaptation of vehicles to serve the elderly and handicapped). It was decided, therefore, that the issue paper would concentrate on the mobility problems of the transportation disadvantaged.

Transportation Disadvantaged in Maryland contains a comprehensive assessment of the situation of transportation of the disadvantaged. The report (1) consolidated information about legislation, funding sources, operating programs, vehicle resources, etc.; (2) outlined major issues such as labor, funding, institutional responsibilities, coordination, technology; and (3) suggested alternatives to meet the problems identified.

Over 400 copies of the report were distributed and the study has already served several useful purposes. The vehicle and operating program inventories have been utilized by the Baltimore Regional Elderly and Handicapped Study. The inventory of private carrier operations is being used for county transportation studies. DSP has also presented a portion of the report to a special conference convened by the Governor's Interagency Committee on Specialized Transportation.

Letters have been received by the Department from the Governor and the Secretary of the Department of Transportation which commend the comprehensive nature of the report and its usefulness for specialized transportation planning. It is hoped that the report will establish the needed environment for development of sound analytical procedures and Statewide policies.

While the study of specialized transportation was occurring, a similar study on linkages between education and work was being prepared. The impetus for this project came through staff participation in a legislative committee established to examine the State's employment conditions. The paper assesses existing linkages and strategies relevant to the development or maintenance of a comprehensive system sensitive to present and future employment and training needs of all segments of the State's population. The paper on education-to-work linkages is still in draft form; therefore, the report has not yet been evaluated.

Analysis of Needs and Conditions

The development of a comprehensive data base is one way of helping State and local human service agencies develop planning capabilities. It was thought that through an analysis of needs and conditions, needs assessment information (or demand) would be combined with an inventory of existing services (supply). The Social Indicator Report was the initial effort toward development of a needs assessment, while the program inventory would represent the supply side. Since social indicators and program inventory analyses concentrated on State services, it was necessary to add an analysis of the role of the voluntary sector in service provision to augment the data base.

Academic journals and periodicals had suggested the need for social indicators to gauge the social status of the nation, similar to the use of economic indicators to measure the state of the economy. The development of social indicators had also been recommended by HEW in its 1969 report, Toward a Social Report. However, most of the systems discussed in the literature were theoretical in nature and had not been practically applied. DSP decided to try to apply social indicators to the State and local levels.

A private consulting firm was retained to aid DSP in indicator development. The tasks to be performed by DSP and the consultant included determining informa-

tion needs by activity sectors; compiling a data inventory; postulating a series of social statistics and candidate set of indicators and testing them for relevancy, reliability, and significance; summarizing the results; preparing an interim report; preparing a users manual; and preparing the final report. Considerable efforts were made to gain input from other agencies in the development of the indicators. A special advisory group of data experts and data managers was convened and specific interviews with key agencies were held. These people were also requested to review the interim report.

The final document, entitled Social Indicator Report: A Conceptual Approach, was published in April 1976. The indicators constructed were not designed to be evaluative or to show cause and effect relationships. Rather, the indicators were a single measure of two or more social statistics which logically depicted the social status of the population of each county in Maryland. Indicators were constructed for each of the major activity sectors used in the HSP&CP. The final major publication in this effort, the Users Manual, was distributed in November 1976 and was the technical documentation of the methodology employed in the report.

Evaluation of social indicators began with the distribution of the report. Included in the cover letter were five questions asking the reader to assess the utility of the indicators. In addition to the responses received in answer to this, a special evaluation meeting was held to discuss possible future updates of the indicators. It had originally been postulated that social indicators would be periodically updated and reproduced to show the change in social status over time, and a major aim of the evaluation was to learn how, or if, the indicators were being used.

All reviewers agreed that data inadequacies were the major stumbling blocks to the development of more useful indicators. The evaluation also revealed that the indicators were not used by agencies in decision making, policy setting, or for

management decisions. In general, it was found that the report had been of limited utility. Many suggestions were received for possible modifications or improvements; however, most of these suggestions proved infeasible or beyond DSP resources or capabilities. Finally, there were several methodological problems that would have proven extremely difficult to resolve to the satisfaction of all users.

Based on this feedback, it was decided that the social indicators would not be updated. Although most agencies found the indicators to be interesting in a general sense, they were found not to be helpful in providing information for specific projects. Nor were the indicators being used by agencies for cross functional comparisons. Also, the user agencies did not endorse the data and social statistics used to generate the indicators. Solution of this problem is difficult, since considerable efforts were made to gain agency input prior to indicator construction.

The Inventory of State Administered Human Service Programs was another element of DSP's efforts to develop a human services information base. The purpose of the inventory was to compile information on all State administered human service programs so that these programs could be analyzed to detect service gaps and duplications. The program inventory was prepared from data compiled from agency interviews, Executive Plans, budget reports and other sources as necessary. Many methodological difficulties were discovered in trying to develop the inventory which resulted in major changes in the original inventory design. Some of the problems encountered were: (1) there was no clear definition of what constitutes a program; (2) it was difficult to analyze the distribution of resources by target group as most programs served more than one group; and (3) it was difficult to find a single source of sufficiently detailed budget information.

The inventory used the Activity Sector/Target Population matrix for classifying human service programs. The report analyzed the distribution of

resources -- both financial and programmatic -- by major functional areas. Special target group analyses for the disabled/handicapped and the elderly were also conducted and a section on program linkages and coordination was included. Approximately 300 copies of the report have been distributed to Cabinet agencies, the General Assembly, local planning, social service and health agencies, and colleges and universities. Staff are presently evaluating the inventory to determine whether or not it should be updated periodically.

Another component in the analysis of needs and conditions was an examination of the role of the voluntary sector in the delivery of social services. In order to learn whether voluntary services complemented or duplicated public sector services, DSP contracted with the Health and Welfare Council of Maryland for a study which would provide a descriptive inventory of voluntary services and which would analyze family life and social developmental services.

The Working Paper on Social Service Delivery in Maryland: An Overview of Programs, Problems and Priorities in the Voluntary Sector was published in April 1975 and contained information on eligibility criteria, program capacity, sources of funds, staff composition and demographic makeup of voluntary agency clientele. A computer printout listing information on all agencies surveyed was also completed and forwarded to DSP. A major benefit of this project was the establishment of a working relationship between the Department of State Planning and the Health and Welfare Council.

Project Management and Evaluation

The Human Services Planning and Coordination Project was a three year effort encompassing a broad range of complex and sophisticated activities. The scope of the Project necessitated competent management and evaluation to insure its success.

Several formal reports were prepared to aid in Project management. These included preparation of an annual detailed work program, preparation of monthly program reports, and staff meetings. The assignment of responsibility for completing work items to specific staff members also contributed to effective management.

Both internal and external evaluations were performed. In-house evaluations were conducted by staff to determine whether Work Program Objectives had been achieved. The Regional and Central Offices of HEW evaluated the Project to determine if objectives of the Partnership Grant were being met. HEW also employed a private consulting firm for the purpose of generally evaluating the Partnership Program throughout the country, and Maryland was chosen as a case study for in-depth review.

The relationship between State Planning and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare did not consist of just evaluations and site visits. Rather, over the course of the Project, both DSP and HEW benefited from the association. Prior to the Project's initiation, a representative from the HEW regional office had participated in the Human Resources Plan advisory group and assisted DSP in obtaining Partnership funds.

The Maryland Project was assigned to the Office of Planning and Evaluation in the Office of the Regional Director for purposes of project and financial monitoring. The role of this Office in monitoring the HSP&CP can best be described as advisory and consultative. Quarterly evaluation reports were submitted by the regional monitors to the HEW Central Office in Washington. The Regional Office also conducted an evaluation midway in the Project to determine the assessment of the HSP&CP by other State and local planning agencies. The results of these assessments were encouraging to DSP.

While the regional monitors were helpful to DSP in many ways, the relationship was far from one-sided. DSP was asked by the regional office to review and prepare comments on a variety of topics. Annually, DSP assisted in the selection of regional issue papers by the preparation of comments and an ordering of topics by priority concern. Staff also reviewed regional reports and responded to questionnaires (often designed by the central office of HEW) that were forwarded to the Department. The regional monitors used DSP as a contact point or liaison to other units of Maryland State government.

DSP's relationship with the central office of HEW was rather formal. In most areas, they chose to use the regional offices as intermediaries between themselves and grantees. It was the responsibility of the regional office to manage Project grants. The central office conducted thorough evaluations of the HSP&CP (sending several key program officials to DSP to meet with the division and section heads, project coordinator, and appropriate staff) at the end of each fiscal year in an effort to review past activities and help determine the appropriate funding level for the project in the next year.

Effective management means that information about the Project should be shared with others in order to demonstrate the potential for transfer of successful work activities. Methods to do this included informing State Executive agencies and the State Legislature of Project activities, responding to specific requests for information, sending reports to Project SHARE, and by staff attendance and participation at conferences.

Through experience gained in completing all the Project's work activities, several improvements in management were initiated. One area was the management of staff and consultants. This included the designation of

project managers for major work activities, ways to minimize disruptions caused by staff turnover, and ways to more effectively supervise private consultants. Project experience has also suggested that lengthy reports should be scaled down either by reducing the scope or purpose of the report or by summarizing and reducing the report's content. Finally, Project staff agreed that the utilization of a report would be enhanced if technical assistance and training accompanied the report's publication and more attention were paid to timely completion of the report.

Not all of the activities listed in the annual work programs were completed; this was a result of several factors. In some instances, the Project developed overly ambitious goals. Inadequate staff resources were sometimes a prohibitive factor. Work activities selected were found to be no longer of critical interest, and therefore, were not completed. The number of uncompleted work activities, though, was very small in comparison to completed and ongoing activities.

Project Accomplishments and Lessons

Success of the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project can be measured from two different but related perspectives. The first way considers the Project's tangible accomplishments such as issue papers, program inventory or social indicators. The second perspective assesses the growth or movement towards improved, coordinated human services planning and delivery. Measures of success for this second approach are more subjective and harder to gauge. They focus on inter-agency planning activities and legislative liaison functions.

Outcomes and accomplishments of the HSP&CP can be most clearly understood when grouped under the three major headings of the work program. These headings are coordination activities, planning and technical assistance, and the analysis of needs and conditions. Coordination activities were geared toward the more efficient utilization of both staff and financial resources within human resources

agencies. Their explicit purposes were the elimination of duplicative efforts and the promotion of harmonious working relationships among those agencies providing similar or related services. The coordination activities of the Human Resources Section throughout the Project led to an ever-increasing awareness of and sensitivity to the value of interagency planning among the human service provider agencies. Appreciation for the role of interagency coordination in problem-solving and issue-resolution was enhanced, and therefore, improved working relationships among several key agencies developed. A network of valuable resource persons in human services planning has also been developed. This network further facilitates interagency coordination.

The Human Resources Section of the Department of State Planning has developed an inter-disciplinary team of staff members with various functional specialties that works together to ensure the comprehensiveness and inter-relatedness of responses to State human resources concerns. This staff works closely together recognizing each other's areas of expertise. For example, as the housing and community development planner works with the Office on Aging on sheltered housing, he consults with the social services planner and the health planner to assure that these other areas of need of the elderly are considered in the developmental aspects of this program. The coordination among staff members has been an integral part of the success of the HSP&CP. It has also helped to assure the comprehensiveness of all work activities of the Project, especially issue papers which specifically address areas of interagency concern. Participation by the Human Resources staff on a wide variety of interagency planning and coordinative groups provides an early opportunity to detect program gaps or duplications. Staff are frequently able to identify areas in need of possible policy clarifications in advance of service delivery agencies because of their participation on these interagency committees. Examples of this include the issue papers on

target groups and purchase of care and reviews of Executive Plans which spotlight areas of potential duplication.

Many outcomes related to planning and technical assistance can be outlined. Most of these relate to the greatly improved quality of human services planning, both of line agencies and the Department of State Planning. The Human Resources staff's ability to provide meaningful planning guidance has improved and the willingness of agencies to accept this assistance has been enhanced. This is especially evident when the quality of Executive Plans is reviewed; substantive plan reviews have been responsible for vast improvements of this planning process over the last four years.

It is also important to recognize an increased awareness of human services planning and concerns among physical planners (both within the Division of Comprehensive Planning and the major State agencies) in such areas as transportation, land use, sewer/water quality, recreation, etc. Physical and social planning had previously not been adequately related. There now exists a significantly improved integration of physical and social planning within the State. This is best illustrated by the attention paid in the State Land Use Plan to concerns such as housing, employment opportunities, and demands for public services.

Preparation of reports on topics of interagency concern with an objective and comprehensive perspective has been a result of planning and technical assistance efforts. Staff selected topics in areas where problems were recognized and where resolution is needed (purchase of care, target groups). Staff also responded to the requests of the Legislature and the Human Services Task Force (deinstitutionalization, coordination of human services). This has led to an increased awareness of the value of human services planning and interagency coordination by the Legislature and the Governor's Office. The Department's

neutrality as an "objective" agency with no turf to defend plus the staff's expertise in human services planning are reasons for requests for development of papers and participation on task forces.

Significant strides have been made in the developmental aspects of the Executive Planning Process: increased sophistication in planning and management in State agencies via the Guidance Manual, specialized training courses, extensive plan reviews and meetings with agency planners and managers have all taken place in the three years of the Project. A pilot Annual Executive Plan Report for the educational sector was prepared last year for the Legislature; it highlights the major trends and directions of the educational agencies' plans.

The placement of a planner in the Department of Human Resources has improved the planning capacity of that agency and has strengthened the ties between DSP and DHR. The planner has endeavored to integrate the various DHR planning requirements and has also provided technical assistance to the Cecil County planning project. The Department of Human Resources is interested in the model being developed there as a local needs assessments methodology.

Prior to the Project, there was very little attention paid to the problems counties were experiencing in human services planning. Through the Cecil County local planning project, both State Planning and the Department of Human Resources have become increasingly sensitive to the particular needs of localities in initiating and sustaining a comprehensive human resources planning process. State Planning is preparing a "Handbook for Local Human Resources Planning" and is committed to providing training in this subject for interested jurisdictions. The Cecil County experience has also tested and proven new models of State-local cooperation--truly effecting a "working" partnership.

Another example of State-local cooperation is evidenced by the working relationship Human Resources staff have developed with the Baltimore City Planning Department. After transferring a portion of its Partnership Grant to that Department to develop a series of planning papers in the first year of the Project, the Department of State Planning is now working with the Department of City Planning for the purpose of resolving data problems so that DSP may possibly assist in a Statewide test of the locally designed day care model.

Increased attention to the planning processes of local governments and regional planning organizations by the State is evident in a number of areas. Staff have devoted significant energies to assisting the Regional Planning Council as they produced their General Development Plan. They have also assisted Montgomery County's Office of Human Resources in their work in social indicators and resource allocation. Staff have acted as facilitators to link Montgomery County's Office of Human Resources, Baltimore City's Planning Department, and the Health and Welfare Council on the issue of services classification systems and Cecil, Kent and Howard Counties on the processes of human resources planning. An enhanced relationship with the Health and Welfare Council has provided the State with a unique perspective of the voluntary sector service network. The last year, especially, has seen a marked increase in the level of cooperation between DSP and HWC.

Activities in the area of the analysis of needs and conditions were primarily designed to provide a data base for coordinated human services planning. These activities probably represented the Department's largest venture into uncharted waters. Clearly, work in the areas of social indicators and program inventory was novel for the State and these efforts were not initially met with resounding acceptance. The sophistication of human resources planning has increased through the work the Department has initiated towards the development of a unified data base for planning. Staff have also developed the ability to thoroughly evaluate

these efforts to review their utility and assess the value of continuation of such efforts.

Several Project outcomes fall outside any of the three major work headings of the HSP&CP. These are discussed in terms of the general and overall impact of the Project. There now exists a considerably improved State-Federal relationship since the "pre-Partnership" days. The Human Resources Section is now regularly requested to review draft documents and reports and to respond to questionnaires and surveys from HEW. This relationship has every reason to continue past the receipt of Federal funds.

Upon the conclusion of the HSP&CP, the Human Resources Section staff have been able to reflect upon several lessons that can be shared with other Partnership Grantees or interested jurisdictions. These "lessons" are broad and generic in nature, being built upon all of the Project's activities rather than any specific product or effort. The Maryland Project found the definition of objectives by HEW for its Partnership Programs to be vague and non-specific. The HSP&CP was built upon the assumptions that if individual agencies' planning capacities were improved and there was a greater and more meaningful level of coordination between and among human service agencies, then the overall level of human services planning in the State would improve. Accomplishment of these two tasks was seen as equivalent to meeting HEW's Partnership objective. The following is a list of lessons which DSP learned as a result of the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project.

- (1) A large number of activities were undertaken by Project staff in order to meet the non-specific objective of "capacity building." It is more advisable to start with a limited focus and then branch out to other areas after a level of credibility and a proven track record have been established.
- (2) The process-versus-product dichotomy which often plagues comprehensive human services planning was successfully resolved by DSP. A coordinated services planning process was institutionalized and tangible work products such as special issue papers and data base reports were produced.

- (3) Staff of the Human Resources Section have also recognized the importance of maintaining a realistic perspective when working on any major planning initiative. Major change within bureaucratic organizations takes a great deal of time. Planning staff need to be cognizant of the operating constraints that are imposed upon functional or service delivery agencies and must be aware of the realities of these constraints. Parallel to a sensitivity to the bureaucratic environment, project staff should attempt to work in a manner that is consistent with Executive and Legislative styles.

Probably the most important facet of the HSP&CP was the staff and the Project's ability to remain flexible to the needs of many actors--including planners and managers in functional agencies, the Legislature, and the Governor. It was this flexibility that ultimately helped to assure the success of the Project. A final testimony to that success is the fact that all of the staff positions within the Human Resources Section have been retained. The Project has successfully institutionalized its planning effort based on the value of the work completed during the three short years of its life. The Section's work program for the first year after the Partnership Grant period reflects continued involvement in interagency coordination and planning groups, the provision of technical assistance to State and local agencies, and the preparation of a variety of issue papers.

The chart on the following two pages represents a listing of all of the major work activities undertaken during the Project. It helps to graphically portray the amount of time devoted to each activity and the sequence of activities. It also indicates those activities that are of an ongoing nature by a line across the full three-year period.

Project Reports and Publications

Present Status and Future Directions of the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project—December 1974

Working Paper on Social Service Delivery in Maryland: An Overview of Programs, Problems, and Priorities in the Voluntary Sector—April 1975

Deinstitutionalization: Problems and Opportunities—March 1976

Social Indicator Report: A Conceptual Approach—April 1976

Technical Documentation and Assessment for Social Indicator Report for Maryland—April 1976

Inventory of State Administered Human Service Programs—November 1976

Executive Planning Process Guidance Manual—March 1975, November 1975, November 1976

Organizational Approaches to Serve the Needs of Special Target Groups—March 1977

Purchase of Care in Maryland—March 1977

Transportation for the Disadvantaged in Maryland—September 1977

A Handbook for Local Human Services Planning—to be issued

Coordination Mechanisms in Human Services Planning and Delivery—February 1978

Education-to-Work Linkages—to be issued.

100

FX 178

Work Activity	1st Qtr	2nd Qtr	3rd Qtr	4th Qtr	1st Qtr	2nd Qtr	3rd Qtr	4th Qtr	1st Qtr	2nd Qtr	3rd Qtr	4th Qtr	1st Qtr
<u>PROJECT INITIATION</u>													
Governor's Cabinet Meeting													
Present Status & Future													
Directions Report													
<u>COORDINATION ACTIVITIES</u>													
Interagency Planning				on-going									
Legislative Liaison				on-going									
Human Services Task Force ¹													
Human Services Council													
<u>PLANNING & TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE AGENCIES</u>													
Executive Planning Process				on-going									
DHR Placements													
--1st Planner													
--2nd Planner													
General Technical Assistance Activities				on-going									
<u>PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL AND REGIONAL AGENCIES</u>													
Baltimore City Local Test				on-going									
Montgomery County				on-going									
Regional Planning Council				on-going									
Health & Welfare Council				on-going									
Cecil County													
Guidebook for Human Resources Planning													

* thru April 1978

* thru Nov 8, 1977

FY '75

FY 176

FY 77

FY '78

Work Activity

ISSUE PAPERS

Deinstitutionalization

Coordination in Human Sections

Purchase of Care

Target Groups

Transportation Disadvantaged

Education -to-Work Linkages

ANALYSIS OF NEEDS & CONDITIONS

Social Indicators

Program Inventory

Voluntary Sector Report

work began in Spring 1974.

II. BACKGROUND AND PROJECT INITIATION

The Department of State Planning was involved in comprehensive human service planning prior to the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project, although the extent of the Department's activities was of a much more limited nature. Two major responsibilities are mandated by Article 88C of the Annotated Code of Maryland -- coordination of plans and programs and preparation of plans for the development of the State. Specifically, the Department is charged with the following responsibilities:

- Prepare, and from time to time amend, revise, or change, a plan or plans for the development of the State, which plan or plans collectively shall be known as the State development plan. The plan shall be based on studies of physical, social, economic, and governmental conditions and trends and shall aim at the coordinated development of the State in order to promote the general welfare and prosperity of the people. In preparing the State development plan or any part thereof, and in preparing, from time to time, revisions, amendments, extensions or additions, the Department shall seek the comments of and consult with the local governments of the areas which are affected by the plan and shall seek the cooperation and advice of other appropriate departments, agencies and instrumentalities of federal, State and local governments, regional and metropolitan planning commissions, educational institutions and research organizations, whether public or private, and of civic groups and private persons and interested organizations. The State development plans shall embody the policy recommendations of the Department of State Planning in regard to the economic and physical development of the State;
- Act as the Governor's principal staff agency in planning matters concerning the resources and development of the State and, in this capacity, undertake special studies and investigations, submit reports and render advice to the Governor whenever he may request;
- Advise the Governor on the means and methods available to coordinate plans and programs of all State departments, agencies, commissions and instrumentalities in order to establish relative priorities and to avoid duplication and conflicts;

Consistent with this mandate, and building upon the Department's involvement in human resources planning, the Division of Comprehensive Planning began assembling a small Human Resources staff during 1971 and 1972 consisting of an education planner, health planner, housing planner, criminal justice planner, manpower planner and social services planner. These planners were primarily responsible for completing internal reviews, accumulating information on State human service agencies, and becoming informed of activities of other State agencies.

The Department proposed a Human Resources Plan as one element of the State Development Plan. During the first six months of 1974, a Study Design for the Human Resources Plan was prepared by private consultants in conjunction with DSP staff. The Study Design proposed a human services planning process that would: (1) assist Executive and Legislative decision makers in allocating the State's resources in as efficient and effective a manner as possible toward meeting the human service needs of Marylanders; and (2) assist nongovernmental providers of human services to better serve their clients by providing a coordinative State planning process for human resources, and by providing access to data resources with which to identify needs, plan for service delivery and evaluate service effectiveness. The Study Design addressed the major problem associated with human services planning and service delivery: the lack of coordination among the many public and private agencies engaged in the delivery of human services.

Much of the work on the Study Design was supported through a Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) "701" Comprehensive Planning Grant. This work helped to provide background information for a subsequent proposal to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) for a Partnership Grant. The proposal to HEW for a Human Resources Plan was submitted in the Spring of

1974 and included many of the planning concepts developed through the HUD grant. However, a major new direction was added: a proposal to develop human services planning capabilities -- known as capacity building -- in other State agencies. The central thrust of the Human Resources Plan was to improve the ability of State and local government to plan and manage their human services programs in a manner most responsive to identified needs with an efficient use of resources.

During this time, many other state governments were reorganizing and creating "umbrella" human resources agencies (often through SITO grants) to encourage services integration and to more efficiently allocate resources. DSP suggested a comprehensive planning approach as an alternative. Maryland State government had recently been reorganized and the comprehensive planning approach would maximize service coordination within its current framework.

To improve human services planning, the Human Resources Plan would assist State and local agencies by improving coordination, by providing technical assistance and by developing a comprehensive data base. These concepts were incorporated into the following goals of the Plan:

- I. To assist executive and legislative decision-makers in determining how best to allocate the State's resources in the most efficient, effective manner possible, toward meeting the human service needs and improving the life condition of the citizens of Maryland.
- II. To assist nongovernmental and substate governmental providers of human services to better serve their clients by:
 - a. providing clear statements of State-level policies;
 - b. providing a State planning process for human services with which to coordinate and through which to offer input; and
 - c. providing access to data resources with which to identify needs, plan service delivery, and evaluate service effectiveness.

To accomplish these goals, the Plan would examine the current system of human services based on an inventory of all State human service programs and

through the development of indicators of social status. Because these efforts would require the collection and analysis of large amounts of data, it was necessary to construct a standardized framework for classifying the information. The Activity Sector/Target Population (AS/TP) matrix was devised to meet this need.

The AS/TP matrix provides a framework for examining the need for and supply of services. It defines broad areas of human concern -- activity sectors -- and subdivides these into more specialized subsectors. Each activity sector and subsector is assigned a numerical code for identification purposes. The activity sectors are defined by functional areas such as "Preservation and Improvement of Health" and "Promotion of Educational Development" which cross departmental service lines. This enables identification of interagency linkages in the provision of similar or supportive services.

The complete Activity Sector scheme follows. | It should be noted that the AS/TP framework presented below varies slightly from the original formulation proposed by the consultants in the Study Design. As experience was gained during the course of the Partnership Grant, several subsectors were modified.

HUMAN SERVICES CLASSIFICATION SCHEME

Class Code

01 Preservation and Improvement of Health

Sub Class Code

01	Personal Health/Physical Health/Physically Handi- capped
02	Personal Health/Mental Health/Mentally Handicapped
03	Health Planning and Information
04	Regulation
05	Support
09	Other

- 02 Public Safety and Justice
 - 01 Public Safety
 - 02 Crime Incidence, Prevention and Control
 - 03 The Adjudicatory System
 - 04 Institutional Rehabilitation
 - 05 Alternatives to Institutional Correction
 - 06 Multi-Functional
- 03 Advancement of Economic Well-Being
 - 01 Economic Growth
 - 02 Expanding Employment Opportunities and Earning Levels
 - 03 Income Maintenance
 - 04 Employee Benefits, Protection and Labor Relations
 - 05 Consumer Affairs
 - 09 Other
- 04 Promotion of Educational Development
 - 01 Development of Basic Skills
 - 02 Opportunity to Acquire Academic and Professional Skills
 - 03 Development of Vocational/Technical Skills
 - 04 Cultural Enrichment
 - 05 Utilization of Communications Technology
 - 06 General Administration, Planning and Research
- 05 Provision of Adequate Housing and Community Environment
 - 01 Community and Neighborhood Improvement
 - 02 Housing Needs of Special Groups
 - 03 Development of New or Expanding Communities
 - 04 Safe and Sanitary Housing
 - 09 Other
- 06 Meeting Human Transportation Needs
 - 01 Urban Transportation
 - 02 Rural Transportation
 - 03 Specialized Services
 - 09 Other
- 07 Expanding Recreational Opportunities
 - 01 Community Recreation
 - 02 Land and Water Recreation
- 08 Obtaining Optimal Human and Environmental Interaction
 - 01 Energy Resources and Use
 - 02 Use of Land and Water Resources
 - 03 Maintenance of a Healthful Environment
 - 09 Other

09	Development of Social Potential
01	Personal Interaction Services
02	Facilitative Services
03	Care Services
04	Functional Services
05	Administration
06	Civil Rights
09	Other

An additional dimension was added to the classification scheme with the inclusion of target groups. Target groups were defined as stages in the life cycle, with age distinctions, and several groups with special vulnerabilities were also included. The target groups selected were:

- Infant and Young Child -- (0-5 years)
- Children -- (6-12 years)
- Youth -- (13-18 years)
- Young Adult -- (19-25 years)
- Adult -- (26-64 years)
- Aged -- (65 and over)
- Economically Disadvantaged
- Disabled and Handicapped

The information framework is organized into a matrix. The target groups and activity sectors are the elements of the horizontal and vertical axes respectively. Each cell, therefore, is a unit of analysis which could be applied to a study of existing services, needs and resources, or recommendations for a particular population.

On June 14, 1974, HEW informed the Department of State Planning that their proposal for a State Human Resources Plan had been approved. As a condition of the grant award, DSP submitted a detailed work program for the first year. Major work activities included: (1) review of consultant work to date; (2) interdepartmental planning and coordination; (3) conditions and trends analysis; (4) planning process design; (5) voluntary sector study; and (6) a local test of the major concepts of human services planning and coordination.

Initiation of the Project began immediately upon receipt of the HEW funds. During the first six months of the Project (July-December 1974) three significant activities occurred: staff recruitment, the Governor's Cabinet Meeting, and the publication of Present Status and Future Directions of the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project.

STAFFING

With the HEW grant award, DSP began expanding its comprehensive human services planning system. The first major activity was recruiting a staff for the Human Resources Section. Staff of the Human Resources Section are functional planners in the areas of health, social services, criminal justice, housing, education and manpower. HEW funds were used to provide continuing support for these positions and help guarantee the retention of two of these positions. The Partnership Grant also provided funds to expand the staff by two new positions. One position was for a generalist human services planner. The second position was for a planner to coordinate the Executive Planning Process. Partnership funds also enabled DSP to hire contractual employees and to engage private consultants for short term projects. Consultants and contractual employees allowed the Department to augment its Human Resources staff without creating additional permanent positions.

Although only two new positions were authorized, five new staff members joined the section during the last six months of 1974. This resulted from the coincidental resignations of several functional planners. Thus, work began on the Partnership Grant Project by a predominantly new staff of the Human Resources Section.

A Section organizational change was also made. The social services planner was designated as the Project Coordinator. The Coordinator would serve as the liaison between HEW and the Department, and was responsible for preparing the

monthly progress reports and generally guiding the Project . to assure that all Project work elements would be completed promptly and satisfactorily. Overall supervision was provided by the Chief of the Human Resources Section and the Division Director.

Since planners in the Human Resources Section advise staff in other DSP divisions, it is helpful to understand the organizational structure of the Department of State Planning. The Department is organized into five divisions: General Administration (which includes the State Clearinghouse), Regional and Local Planning, Research, Capital Improvements, and Comprehensive Planning. The Comprehensive Planning Division is divided into two sections: the Physical and Environmental Resources Section and the Human Resources Section.

A major task of the Comprehensive Planning Division is to formulate plans for the development of the State by providing the framework for land use and human resources planning Statewide. Additionally, the Division has responsibility for review and comments on A-95 plans, programs and projects in the Clearinghouse. In the absence of planning staffs in other agencies, the Division will, as priorities permit, accept the responsibility for preparing necessary functional plans. The Division is also a major participant in the development of the Executive Planning Process and will seek to develop, demonstrate, and institute innovative planning methods.

The working relationship between liaison staff in the Sections of the Comprehensive State Planning Division and the planning staffs of other departments is most important. The Section staff provide direct liaison with functional State departments to stimulate and encourage them to develop and improve their capabilities to analyze problems and formulate plans and programs. To improve these activities, the Department, through the Comprehensive State Planning Divi-

sion, can enter into joint ventures with other State departments to formulate objectives, plans, programs and implementation procedures.

As indicated by the preceding description, Human Resources staff have dual functional responsibilities. They are responsible for completing the various work elements of the HEW Project and are also responsible for providing planning assistance to other divisions of the Department.

CABINET MEETING

In July 1974, DSP was requested to explain to the Governor's Cabinet the Human Resources Plan's preparation process being funded by HEW. This was a unique opportunity for two reasons: (1) Cabinet attention was focused on the need for comprehensive human services planning, and (2) few other departments had ever been requested to explain their plans. The presentation to the Cabinet consisted of an explanation of why human resources planning was needed and a description of the Plan Elements, e.g., program inventory, social indicators, interagency planning coordination, issue papers, etc.

The concept of a comprehensive human services planning process evoked some interesting reactions from Cabinet members and several important suggestions were offered. A major concern was that State resources would be inadequate to meet all the human service problems which would probably be identified. It was important to foster interagency coordination so that scarce resources would not be wasted or duplicated. Overall, Cabinet members expressed interest in the project and asked to be kept informed of its progress.

Concurrently, DSP realized that some of the goals and objectives envisioned for the Human Resources Plan were overly ambitious. Further, staff agreed with the comments from the Governor's Cabinet that greater attention should be given to increasing coordination efforts. Therefore, to reflect this change, the Human Resources Plan effort was retitled the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project.

The name change helped to emphasize that the Project was a dynamic rather than a static process. The use of the word "Plan" had caused confusion. To some people a plan connotated a single, final document. The change to Human Services Planning and Coordination Project indicated that the output would be a series of reports and papers that would be issued as the various work elements were completed. Most importantly, the change to Human Services Planning and Coordination Project emphasized that the Project would develop an ongoing planning process.

REPORT ON PRESENT STATUS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

It was decided to prepare a written progress report because considerable interest had been expressed in the Project by State agencies and the Cabinet and because of the new directions being taken in the Project. The report, Present Status and Future Directions of the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project (1974), was an informational document that outlined the reasons for engaging in the Project, the accomplishments at the time the report was written, and future activities. The report described the activities initiated and those scheduled by the Department up to December 1974, and the work required to carry out such activities to completion. The progress report provided an overview or a framework of the entire Project and explained each of the work activities. The report was broadly disseminated in an effort to help people understand the purpose of the Project and to learn about anticipated activities. The report was distributed to members of the Human Resources Task Force, the Cabinet, the General Assembly, local human service agencies, and other interested parties Statewide.

With the completion of the Present Status Report and the recruitment of new staff members, work began on completing the elements of the Human Services Plan-

ning and Coordination Project. The remainder of the case study will discuss these work elements. The report is organized according to the work program headings which reflect the Project's major goals -- coordination, technical assistance to State and local agencies, issue papers, and an analysis of needs and conditions.

III. COORDINATION ACTIVITIES

The Project recognized that there was a need for coordination in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of human services. As the Governor's staff agency charged with the task of "coordinating the plans and programs of all State departments, agencies and instrumentalities,"¹ the Human Resources staff are charged with coordinating human services activities. To accomplish this, the staff participate on a variety of interagency committees. Participation on such committees is explicitly designed to foster interagency communication and to interject an objective planning perspective into the groups' activities. Because the Department of State Planning is not a functional, or service delivery agency, the staff are generally viewed by other agencies as non-threatening and non-biased participants.

Coordination responsibilities also include being aware of plans and programs of human service agencies in order to spot potential duplication as well as informing agencies of complementary programs offered by other agencies. To accomplish this, staff, in addition to interagency committee participation, performed a legislative review and liaison function. Coordination may be frustratingly difficult to achieve due to its intangible nature. For this reason, two specific tangible work items were included under the coordination element. Due to the diverse nature of the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project, there was a need to inform others of DSP planning activities and to coordinate these activities with other agencies. The Human Services Task Force was created to serve this purpose.

Coordination was also needed among the Executive departments and DSP proposed a Human Services Council to accomplish this. The Council would have been composed of

¹Article 88C, Maryland Annotated Code.

Cabinet Secretaries from human service departments who would regularly meet to decide policies on issues which crossed agency lines.

INTERAGENCY PLANNING ACTIVITIES

These activities provide an opportunity for DSP staff to participate on inter-agency planning and coordination committees and task forces. Through Committee participation, DSP staff are able to educate others about planning concerns and techniques, interject planning considerations, and inform others about relevant activities of the Department. Participation also allows the staff to learn of the activities, needs and concerns of other agencies and gain an appreciation for direct service considerations.

Committee participation provided an opportunity to impact the service delivery system. The comprehensive approach of the DSP staff provided a broader perspective to discussions that often were focused on immediate needs. In addition, the staff benefitted from learning about the problems and difficulties experienced by the service providers. The exchange of ideas involved in these activities was an important component in building mutual respect and understanding and fostered interagency cooperation.

During the course of the HSP&CP project, staff served on 41 different inter-agency groups (see Chart 1). The range of activities and diverse purposes of these committees indicates the extent to which DSP staff participated in human service planning and delivery activities. The list also shows participation in many special purpose task forces. This was consistent with the Governor's guidance given when the Human Services Council proposal was rejected (This is discussed later in the chapter). The Governor preferred to create interagency, special purpose working committees rather than a formal Council structure.

During the three years of the Project, the quality and level of participation by the Human Resources Staff have improved. At first, involvement meant attendance and

observance at meetings, and then preparation of memos to the Secretary summarizing major points. Involvement is now more active and in some committees, staff participation has had a major impact. For example, staff input into the Governor's Steering Committee for the Development of a Plan for Protection and Advocacy of the Developmentally Disabled was important in changing the Plan's focus from a legal to an advocacy orientation. Similarly, review of the Draft Domiciliary Care Plan prepared by the Office on Aging resulted in the creation of a special gubernatorial committee to provide an interagency approach to this problem.

During annual evaluations and planning for the next year's work program, staff members evaluate their participation on committees and recommend whether or not participation should continue. As a result of one of these annual evaluations, new procedures for staff participation developed. Efforts are made to obtain the Secretary's advice on controversial matters prior to committee meetings in order that staff may participate more effectively.

Staff also became more selective in accepting invitations for committee membership. During FY 74, the Department accepted membership whenever requested, and in some cases, staff asked to be included as members. Now the staff carefully evaluates requests for committee participation to determine whether or not the purpose of the committee is to foster interagency coordination and also to determine if DSP could meaningfully contribute.

Several guidelines for accepting committee membership have now been developed. Briefly, these criteria are:

- The committee should be interagency in membership and purpose;
- DSP has previously been involved in the problem area to be studied by the committee;
- The issues being addressed by the committee have Statewide implications;
- The issues being addressed by the committee are within DSP's mandated functional responsibilities.

CHART NO. 1

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES

<u>Committees/Task Forces</u>	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>FY 77</u>
Community Coordinated Child Care Committee (4-C)	X	X	X
Division of Corrections Planning Task Force	X		
Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice Training Task Force	X		
Juvenile Services on Vocational Training Program Proposal	X		
Task Force on Health and Special Education Facilities (RICAS I and II, Western Maryland Retardation Center I)	X	X	X
Governor's Commission on Funding Education for Handicapped Children (Schifter)	X	X	X
The Maryland State Department of Education's Committee to Develop a State Plan for Training Teachers for the Handicapped	X		
The Task Force for Developing a State Plan for Vocational-Technical Education	X	X	X
Maryland Advisory Committee on Vocational-Technical Education	X	X	X
Maryland Comprehensive Health Planning Advisory Committee/State Health Coordination Council (Ex-officio)	X	X	X
State-Local Comprehensive Health Planning Monthly Meetings	X	X	X
Maryland Commission on Aging	X		
Department of Economic and Community Development Task Force on the Overall State Economic Development Plan (Technical Panels)	X	X	X
Advisory group to assist the program of minority businessmen operated by the Department of Economic and Community Development	X		
Governor's Interagency Committee on Specialized Transportation	X	X	X
Regional Coalition on Handicapped Children, Regional Planning Council	X	X	
Governor's Interagency Committee to Review the Domiciliary Care Plan		X	X
Office on Aging Interagency Task Force on Planning and Budgeting of Services for the Elderly		X	X

<u>Committees/Task Forces</u>	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>FY 77</u>
Area Housing Council, Regional Planning Council		X	X
Housing Technical Human Resources Committee, Washington Council of Governments	X	X	X
State Manpower Services Council	X	X	X
Regional Economic Task Force		X	X
Governor's Task Force to Implement 93-641		X	X
Regional Emergency Medical Services Advisory Committee	X	X	X
Health Manpower Advisory Committee	X	X	X
Committee on Legal Education		X	
Consortium for Coordinated Planning in Special Education		X	
Maryland Consortium on Urban Management		X	
Governor's Steering Committee for Development of a Protection and Advocacy Plan for the Mentally Disabled			X
Developmental Disabilities Council		X	X
DHMH Facilities Plan Steering Committee		X	X
Major Facilities Study, Energy and Coastal Zone Administration			X
Regional Planning Council Advisory Committees for General Development Plan			X
Joint DSP/DECD Task Force		X	
Joint DSP/DECD Housing Subcommittee		X	X
Advisory Committee on Correctional Rehabilitation Programming			X
Coordinating Committee on Prison Construction			X
Task Force to Study Circuit Court Unification			X
State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee			X
State Board of Higher Education Master Plan -- State Agency Liaison Committee			X
Joint DSP/DBFP/MDC-DOP Task Force on EPP Training		X	X

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON

One of the Department of State Planning's legal mandates requires that the Department "provide information to and cooperate with the Maryland General Assembly or any of its Committees in connection with studies relevant to State Planning." Consistent with this mandate, HSP&CP staff, since the inception of the Project, have monitored State legislation relevant to human services planning, service delivery, and interagency coordination.

Legislative liaison activities are performed in several ways. During the annual legislative session, the staff prepares legislative reviews and recommends Departmental positions, and presents DSP's recommendations in written or oral comments. When a particular bill is determined to be of major interest, hearings are attended to learn about the positions and concerns of both the bill's proponents and opponents. Staff prepare letters to legislative committee chairmen, and may testify at hearings when appropriate.

During the interim, staff often operate in an advisory capacity providing information on request to legislators and participating on various committees created by legislative resolution for the conduct of special studies. In addition, since 1976, the Maryland General Assembly has greatly extended its activities between sessions through creation of Committees for the Legislative Interim. This change has resulted in staff providing such informational assistance as needed by these Committees during the Interim.

All staff have been called on to review proposed legislation. During the 1977 session, written comments were prepared on over 100 separate bills and resolutions. Direct staff assistance to the Legislature and its two staff agencies, the Departments of Legislative Reference and Fiscal Services, over the course of the Project has also involved most staff and has included such topics as deinstitutionalization, purchase of care, target group services, and coordination

mechanisms. (These reports are discussed in detail elsewhere in this report). After bills are passed by both Houses of the Legislature, staff also assist the Departmental Secretary in his advice to the Governor on whether or not to sign a bill.

Although a majority of staff time in this area is directed toward the State General Assembly, staff also review proposed Maryland Rules and Regulations and proposed Federal laws and rules published in the Federal Register. Similar to the Federal process, proposed rules to implement Maryland State laws are published in the Maryland Register.

One disappointment occurred during the conduct of this activity. The staff were unable to fulfill an item in the 1976 Work Program to prepare a summary of human services legislation enacted during the State Legislative Session. It was intended that this report would then have been distributed to relevant State and local agencies with follow-up work by DSP staff to better acquaint these agencies with the legislative process. Due to conflicting work priorities, preparation of this report was not possible and led to the work item being eliminated.

A number of positive benefits have been derived through DSP's participation in the legislative process. Firstly, it has heightened the visibility of human services planning and permitted a greater infusion of human services related planning concepts into legislative decisions than would otherwise have occurred. Secondly, it has raised staff consciousness regarding human services problems and priorities as viewed from the perspective of the State Legislature and helped develop an understanding of the interests of legislators in social programs. Thirdly, analysis of the types of bills introduced frequently has been found to provide a forewarning of emerging popular issues or shifts in policy direction

through identification of new trends in legislation. Fourthly, indications are that many legislators welcome DSP as an additional information resource in assessing the relative merits of the bills before them. The long-range consequences and interdepartmental impact of these proposals are not otherwise considered in legislative deliberations. Fifth and finally, through liaison activity, it is thought that HSP&CP staff have been in a position to positively impact on human services related legislation introduced into the Maryland General Assembly. A definite role for staff has therefore been established as an advisory and informational resource in the legislative process.

Both coordination activities and legislative review were ongoing responsibilities of the Human Resources Section. The Human Services Task Force and Human Service Council were time-specific activities.

HUMAN SERVICES TASK FORCE

The Department of State Planning had long recognized the value of and need for obtaining input and advice from public and private agencies. The State Planning and Coordinating Committee was established in January 1973 to serve as a forum for interagency and intergovernmental coordination and to review the Departmental activities: the Multi-Service Center Study, the Human Resources Plan and the Land Use Plan. All State Cabinet level agencies, all county governments, all regional planning agencies, and relevant Federal agencies were represented on this Committee. Members of the State Planning Coordinating Committee met regularly to discuss materials sent to them concerning the three projects, to monitor the Department of State Planning's work products, and to provide DSP with materials they considered pertinent.

During the first quarter of 1973, the Human Resources staff were preparing the Study Design for the Human Resources Plan. Following review of preliminary

Study Design for the Human Resources Plan by the State Planning Coordinating Committee, a small group was established to review the Study Design in greater detail and recommend revisions. Members of the Departments of Employment and Social Services, Education, Economic and Community Development, the Comprehensive Health Planning Agency, the Regional Planning Council, Montgomery County and Baltimore City Planning Agencies, and a representative from HEW were involved in this undertaking. The input of this human resources review group was extremely helpful and the Department decided to continue to use this group as the nucleus of the Human Services Task Force.

One reason for creating the Human Services Task Force was the need to work with other agencies to develop support for and solicit input into a comprehensive human services planning process. The State Planning Coordinating Committee, which comprised some human service agency representatives, was too large and broadly oriented to be useful. It was decided that a smaller group composed of 25 people from the public and private sectors and the academic community, who were directly involved in human services, would be more appropriate.

In the application to HEW for the Partnership Grant, the need to expand the membership of the Human Services Task Force and its purposes were explained:

Role of the Human Services Task Force

As envisioned in the Human Resources Plan Study Design, the Task Force was to serve in the capacities of "staff participation/liaison" and "information input, and review and comment." It is felt that the Task Force must be an active participant in the entire Human Resources Planning Process.

- Suggestion of initial goals and objectives of the human resources plan efforts of the State, which will, in turn be formulated as a goals/objectives statement of the Department of State Planning;
- Assistance in human resources problem analysis and development of alternative solutions;
- Review and appraisal of the Department of State Planning's work products;

- Description of the existing Human Resources service system;
- Staff assistance within departments and non-public agencies in administering the program inventory and agency survey.

The Task Force was convened in the Summer of 1974 and was most effective in the initial development of the Project. Its chief functions were to provide information on human services, review reports prepared by the Project staff, advise on issue paper topic selections, and generally assist in Project work activities. It was noted that interest and participation in the Task Force was waning by the end of 1975. Meetings lacked dialogue between DSP staff and Task Force members and consequently became onesided presentations on the part of DSP staff. Many members were unclear as to the overall purpose and direction of the HSP&CP and preferred to work on specific subject or problem areas. It was difficult to become interested in those aspects of the Project which were beyond an individual member's area of expertise and knowledge. To improve the Task Force, several people suggested that subcommittees be formed around specific work elements, e.g., social indicators. This, in fact, occurred when ad hoc working groups were designated for the deinstitutionalization study and for social indicators. However, DSP did not want to create a formalized subcommittee structure due to their potential unwieldy and unmanageable nature.

By the end of 1975, it was clear that the Human Services Task Force had achieved its objectives and fulfilled the purposes for which it was created. Thus, it was no longer necessary. As noted in the Third Year Work Program, staff found that with the increasing specificity of Project work elements, there existed a need for more precise input from public and private agencies. Thus, ad hoc issue oriented working groups constituted for purposes of obtaining the advice and guidance of experts on a timely basis were substituted for the more formal Human Services Task Force.

Several positive benefits can be attributed to the Human Services Task Force. The members were extremely helpful in reviewing, revising and monitoring the Project. The Task Force was helpful in suggesting several changes and new directions for the Project and also aided in the selection and development of the initial issue papers. The successor ad hoc advisory groups continue to aid the Department by reviewing and commenting on issue papers and other work elements.

Most importantly, Task Force members became the core of a human services network from which staff still solicit advice and assistance. The Task Force members served as liaisons or functional counterpart planners for Project staff and also served as information contacts.

HUMAN SERVICES COUNCIL

The Human Services Council was never a specific work item in the HSP&CP work program but was developed out of the work activities in coordination and legislative review. During the 1974 General Assembly, several bills were introduced to create special purpose agencies, e.g., Office for the Handicapped, Office for Child Development. The Office on Aging had already been established by Executive Order in January 1974. A review of these various proposals resulted in increased concern over the possible proliferation of State governmental agencies and the management and proper coordination of additional human service agencies. If enacted, these proposals would jeopardize the 1969-70 State government reorganization.

Early in January 1975, staff of the Human Resources Section recommended a Departmental position on target group agencies to the Department of State Planning Secretary. The memorandum anticipated that a variety of bills would again be introduced creating special offices, and with the creation of the Office on Aging, the pressure to create such special offices would be difficult to counter. It was important to define a consistent position applicable to all proposals.

Increased pressure for special offices was largely a result of poor coordination between existing agencies and staff proposed four alternative models to achieve better interagency coordination. |

A follow-up memorandum was sent to the DSP Secretary proposing the creation of a Human Services Council. The Secretary had recently testified before the House Appropriations Committee on alternative human service integration models, including a Cabinet level Council for Human Services. A similar Council on Environmental Quality had already been successfully established and was used as a model for the Human Services Council. As proposed, the Council would be created by Executive Order for the purposes of: (1) improving the delivery of human services; (2) meeting the recognized need for coordination and integration of human services; and (3) making decisions on human service issues which crossed departmental lines. Membership would consist of the Departments of Employment and Social Services (later renamed the Department of Human Resources), Health and Mental Hygiene, Budget and Fiscal Planning, State Planning and Education. Other Departments such as Public Safety and Correctional Services, Economic and Community Development, the State Board for Higher Education, and the Office on Aging would be added on an "as needed" basis. The follow-up memorandum also included suggestions on the mechanics of operating the committee (staffing, meetings, chairmanship, etc.). At the direction of the Secretary, staff drafted a letter to the Governor outlining the above. DSP learned that the Lt. Governor was supportive of this concept, and thus, wrote several letters to his Office further describing the need for and role of the Human Services Council. DSP also discussed the Council with several members of the Governor's staff.

In July, the Departmental Secretary again wrote to the Governor summarizing the past legislative proposals to create special purpose agencies, and included the recommendation that a Human Services Council be established instead. The Executive Office proceeded to consider this suggestion. It was decided to call a special meeting in November 1975 with the Departmental Secretaries of the potential member agencies. After this meeting, the Governor decided not to form the Council. Instead, the Governor preferred to establish working committees at the staff level to solve interagency problems rather than to create a formally structured council.

Staff were disappointed that the Human Services Council was not created but also realized that the need to increase interagency coordination had been recognized by the Governor's Office. Many interagency coordinating committees have since been established in which DSP actively participates.

Many of the Cabinet Secretaries of human service agencies did not see a need for the Council. DSP directed its informational and lobbying efforts towards the Governor and his staff and the Lieutenant Governor, but did not inform and influence other departments and agencies as to the role of the Council. DSP now believes that it is important to contact other agencies to gain support for new proposals, and does so on a regular basis.

In retrospect, the idea of a Human Services Council may have been premature. Two years later a similar proposal to create a Human Needs Council was made by the Governor's Commission on Children and Youth. The recommendation resulted from a planning workshop sponsored by the Commission. DSP also continued its interest in and concern over the role of target group and advocacy agencies in State government, and used much of the background information developed for the Council to prepare the issue paper on "Organizational Approaches to Serve the Needs of Special Target Groups."

IV. PLANNING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE TO STATE AGENCIES

One of the major thrusts of the HSP&CP project had been to develop and improve the State and local capacity for human services planning. It can be said that this goal was realized. As a staff arm to the Governor with functional planners in the health, education, housing, criminal justice, manpower, elderly and social services areas, the Human Resources Section is an interdisciplinary team of planners with a broad grasp of the inter-relationships and linkages among the various human service areas at the State and local levels. Often, program managers and functional planners do not possess such technical resources. This unique capability to approach human resource problems from a comprehensive perspective was made available to State and local agencies to assist them in their planning efforts.

Two types of technical assistance were engaged in by Project staff -- assistance to State agencies and assistance to local and regional planning agencies. The latter will be discussed in the following chapter. To meet planning and technical assistance responsibilities for State agencies, several activities were undertaken. The Executive Planning Process was initiated to improve State decision making by preparation of short and long range plans for each State organization. Two planners were placed with the Department of Human Resources (DHR); these placements permitted a much closer relationship between DHR and DSP and also helped to improve State-local coordination. Other planning assistance to State agencies included reviewing agency plans and programs and reviewing plans and programs submitted by human services agencies to other DSP Divisions.

EXECUTIVE PLANNING PROCESS

In 1973, the Legislature required the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene to develop a three year plan. The request originated from legislative concern

about the directions that Department was setting for itself and the need for policy guidance. An outline was drafted with assistance from the Department of State Planning for the material that should be included. The 1973 Legislative Council reviewed this document and then decided that it would be wise to require all Executive departments to develop similar plans. Thus, the Executive Planning Process (EPP) was formally initiated by the General Assembly and the Governor.

Faced with double digit inflation, a sustained State budget growth that averaged above 16% for the past five years and a concern about the short and long range directions that agencies and Departments were setting for themselves, the Assembly hoped that EPP would provide a more rational planning process. In a letter dated August 8, 1974, to then Lt. Governor Blair Lee, the Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Delegate John Hargreaves, outlined the need for and expected accomplishments of initiating a State planning process.

The need for long-range plans has many roots, but our immediate attention stems from the initiation of the "ceiling" approach to development of the State budget. This approach brought us to the quick realization that annual allocations of limited available revenue in the absence of a longer term plan may lead to "incrementalism" in the budget process, i.e., each agency or department getting some small piece of the pie but no one agency receiving adequate funding for significant needs. Consequently, the Legislature decided it would be helpful to have a longer range plan of economic and program needs which could guide the annual allocation of funds. Using this approach, the resource needs of the departments could be met in a time-phased manner by providing meaningful allocations to the highest priority need areas first, and balancing and alternating the total need over the life of the plan.

Another reason for the Legislature's interest in long range planning is the obvious necessity to set a pattern or sense of direction within which annual budget decisions can be made. We have seen some programs, such as drug abuse, alcoholism and community-based medical services shift without clear momentum or sense of direction which could be provided by a long-range program.

The directive to develop an Executive Planning Process coincided with the HSF&CP goal of developing a coordinative planning process. The need for such

a process was explained in the Partnership Grant application. This coordinative planning process was consistent with Maryland's recent governmental reorganization. It would provide a framework for decision making, increase contacts between agencies which serve the same target groups and would upgrade the ability of functional agencies to do long and short range planning. Since the Executive Planning Process fulfilled these objectives, and to avoid creating duplicative planning requirements, EPP was adopted as the HSP&CP coordinative planning process. This was clarified in the first year work program.

The Legislature had recommended that Executive plans be prepared by existing personnel within the various departments as part of their managerial responsibilities. Also, as part of the Legislature's action, a set of minimum guidelines for the preparation of the first cycle of plans due November 1974 was made available. The Governor directed that the Department of State Planning (responsible for the development of the capital budget) and the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning (responsible for the development of the operating budget) be jointly responsible for administering and overseeing the development of the process. It was decided by both Departments that the minimum guidelines prepared by the Legislature would need to be further developed. At a meeting in August 1974 attended by representatives from all the participating Executive organizations, a Plan Element Outline was distributed by the two staff Departments. It was also noted that plans would be forwarded to the Department of Fiscal Services (DFS - the administrative arm of the General Assembly) which would make the plans and resulting plan reviews available to various legislative committees. Preparing organizations would also forward copies of their plans to DSP and DBFP for review. It was indicated that formal review responses by the two staff Departments and the Legislature would assist the preparing organizations. However, the procedure of developing one consolidated review for each

plan representing the totality of staff concerns was regarded as administratively impractical. Instead, it was agreed by the three staff Departments that each formally prepare and respond to the plans received and circulate copies of all respective reviews to one another. It was agreed, however, that on high priority matters, coordination of responses would be encouraged.

EPP provided a comprehensive forum from which to compare the activities of one human resource agency with those of another on an annual and continuing basis. Review of plans and resulting responses meant that duplications, gaps in services and the need for intra and inter-agency coordination could be identified by HSP&CP staff and brought to the attention of the respective human service organizations. It was necessary that agencies comply with a common set of guidelines and that all plans acknowledge a standard structural criteria in which information could be communicated.

Plan Element Outline (PEO)

In cooperation with DBFP, HSP&CP staff believed that the Plan Element Outline contain both long and short range components of planning rather than require two separate plans. Further, it was agreed that this approach would result in a more reasonable set of plans and avoid the 20 year time frame suggested by the Legislature, but found to be impractical by a number of line agencies. Long range activities were thought to be those which extended beyond six years.

With the question of long and short range parameters established, HSP&CP staff began to develop and perfect the structure and form to be used in plan preparation. It was decided that each plan should consist of a number of "elements." Through much consideration, the Plan Elements developed into a comprehensive means of reporting what problems agencies were facing, what they intended to do to resolve these problems, and what was needed to resolve them.

The Plan Element Outline developed consisted of eight (8) elements. These elements are described as follows: (1) an Executive Summary; (2) the Introduction which identifies the organization's purpose and describes its functioning parts; (3) Goals which deal with the long range planning concerns of the agency; (4) Conditions and Trends which explain the short range problems (or opportunities) impacting the organization; (5) Objectives which discuss the accomplishments the organization intends to achieve or the problems to be resolved; (6) Policy which prioritizes the future work activities and strategies to be employed; (7) Implementation which translates courses of action into work tasks and resource requirements; and (8) Evaluation.

The information generated by these plan elements provides a justification to support the details of an agency's annual budget request prepared later during the fiscal year. The first fiscal year of each plan's implementation element is the same fiscal year for which the Governor submits the Executive operating budget to the Legislature.

Since the PEO serves to structure a flow of logical information from generalization (Goals) to specifics (Implementation), it has aided HSP&CP staff through plan review to spot and pinpoint particular issues among human services agencies and to respond appropriately.

Department of State Planning Review of Plans

Since the planning process serves the interest of budget formulation, the Department of State Planning's Division of Capital Improvement Programming has become an active participant with HSP&CP staff in the review of agency EPP plans. The Capital Improvements Division reviews plans to determine if proposed agency programs and activities account for the need for additional capital facilities. Where such needs appear to be underestimated, CIP reviewers alert HSP&CP staff

and this information is included in the review/response sent back to the submitting agency.

Internally, the review process permits the multi-disciplined HSP&CP staff reviewers to pool knowledge. When areas of planning responsibilities overlap, comments are shared. This internal sharing of information appearing in the various human resource plans readily permits identification of human services areas requiring coordination. The need for coordination is particularly acute when various organizations are serving the same or similar target groups, i.e., youth, the aged.

The Department of State Planning's review responses sometimes are followed by personal meetings with respective agency representatives. In this context, the review comments serve as a formal forum for discussion that usually results in the development of mechanisms to resolve identified concerns. For instance, problems identified in the plans of the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, the Office on Aging, and the Department of Human Resources regarding the need to coordinate the provision of services to the aged have led to the formulation of the Interagency Committee for Planning and Budgeting for Services for the Aged. As a result of the work of this Committee, on which DSP staff is represented, a cost effective consolidated budget for providing coordinated services among the three agencies was developed.

Agency Application of the Planning Process

In developing the process, it was understood that the PEO would be a standard by which all State Organizations would prepare their plans. It was also realized that the 39 Organizations vary in size and staff capacity. The larger Departments and Agencies of the State have evolved an internal planning process which includes the preparation of unit plans. The plans prepared at the

unit level are summarized and consolidated to form the plan issued at the Department level. Plans prepared by these larger organizations in this manner tend to be more general in detail than plans prepared by smaller organizations.

A recognized advantage of the unit planning methodology is that it has improved the flow of communication and information within the larger Departments and Agencies. This has improved their management capability and ability to more efficiently and effectively administer the operations of their respective organizations. This was consistent with the purposes originally envisioned. This management success has been encouraged, and a number of improvements have been incorporated into subsequent revisions of the guidelines.

Generally, agencies have noted that the EPP with its goals, objectives, policies and implementation elements is oriented to planning for the development of decision packages or programs. This has aided management in charting a more reasonable course for the development of future activities. Further development of the Executive Planning Process is needed to more completely relate the plans to budget decisions. Agencies have expressed a desire to have their five year plans linked to the budgetary decisions made by the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning.

This problem was discussed by numerous agency EPP staff in testimony before the Legislature's House Appropriations Committee (September 1977). Although these agencies recognized the many advantages and benefits derived from the EPP, they recommended that State programmatic planning and budget actions be more closely integrated. In subsequent meetings between DBFP and DSP, it was agreed that the next step would have to be the development of integrated planning and budgeting guidelines. A tentative work program has been developed to proceed with this project.

The Guidance Manual/Training Program

After receipt and review of the first set of Executive Plans in November 1974, HSP&CP staff decided to provide agencies with technical assistance for understanding and applying the planning process. Numerous agencies thought that providing such information to in-house staff would help to resolve a number of questions on the interpretation of the guidelines. A first draft EPP Guidance Manual was developed and distributed in March 1975 to all participating agencies. The Department of State Planning included a request in this first Manual for suggestions and comments for improving the Manual, noting that a revised copy was intended for issuance in the Fall of 1975.

In August of 1975, DSP and DBFP staff began work to revise the Guidance Manual. In addition to an improved Plan Element Outline, the Manual included definitions of EPP terminology, distinctions between long and short range planning, a detailed explanation of each of the planning elements and a special section on the planning process. The internal development and integration in each Agency and Department of an ongoing planning process was recognized as being more important than the issuance of any single plan. Furthermore, the management of plan preparation was also a high priority item addressed by the Manual.

While the first version of the Manual was being finalized in March of 1975, discussions with the Department of Personnel's training unit, the Management Development Center (MDC) were initiated. Since existing agency personnel were preparing the Executive Plans, there was a need to provide training seminars. These seminars would provide planning instructions to agency staff management, assist in improving the quality and utility of the plans and help to secure the intent and purposes for which the planning process was initiated. The Management Development Center decided to use the Guidance Manual as the basic text for the seminars.

The revised Manual, issued jointly by DSP and DBFP, was field tested by attendees at the EPP Seminar of November 1975. Reaction to the Manual was quite favorable. By December, over 700 copies had been circulated to management staff in each of the 39 participating organizations.

A joint proposal from DSP, MDC, and DBFP staff to develop an EPP training program was prepared and forwarded in June 1975 to the Secretaries of the three respective Departments. In August, the proposal was approved. In September, in concert with DSP and DBFP, EPP staff were assigned advisory roles in the development of the training program, and an instructor was hired by MDC to develop the course curriculum and conduct the training sessions. In November 1975, the first of a continuing series of EPP four-day seminars was offered.

Comments made during the question and answer sessions at the seminars proved invaluable in determining needed improvements to planning guidelines. The continuing training program provides an opportunity for agency staff to become better acquainted with the use and application of the Executive Planning Process, and also offers a forum for experimentation, innovation and further development of EPP. Since its inception in November 1975, 25 training sessions have been conducted and over 550 State managers have been provided instruction. Five seminar courses were customized and tailored for individual organizations. Four one-day modules, offering specific instruction in various aspects of the application of EPP, have been made available and are now offered on a continuous basis.

Annual Executive Plan Report (AEPR)

In July 1975, the Department of State Planning in testimony before the House Appropriations Committee outlined the need for an Annual Executive Plan Report to bring together in a consolidated manner the major issues and priorities expressed independently in each EPP plan. It was indicated that such a report

could highlight the direction of State government for the short and long range. In reaffirming its support for the continuation of the Executive Planning Process, the 1975 Fiscal Reports to the Legislative Council of the General Assembly included DSP's recommendation that an Annual Executive Plan Report should be made available for Executive and Legislative branches. A tentative document was developed in March 1977 on education sector agencies and was generally well received.

Benefits of the Executive Planning Process

EPP has been successful in providing a long and short range planning process. Its benefits to the State include the following:

- (1) Development of a uniform system for State governmental planning in Maryland in which the diverse capabilities and activities of personnel in staff and line organizations are brought together in a collaborative effort.
- (2) Increased interagency communication fostering greater awareness and cooperation among organizations through identification of activities with the same or closely related purpose or serving the same target group or geographic area.
- (3) Progress toward consideration of a more effective and efficient methodology for the allocation of resources at all levels of government. An example of the progress made in more efficient resources allocation is the Interagency Committee for Planning and Budgeting of Aging Services comprised of representatives from the Departments of Human Resources, Health and Mental Hygiene, State Planning, and the Office on Aging.
- (4) Increased capability to consider future implications beyond the immediate fiscal year.
- (5) Establishment of a coherent set of goals and objectives for each organization.
- (6) Better public understanding and acceptance of State programs as a result of an improved information base and a more cogent justification for program selection and priorities.
- (7) An increased management capability for State organizations.

A major problem recognized in the Study Design for a Human Resources Plan and the Partnership application was the need to improve the ability of State government to continuously assess needs, analyze options, set priorities, and allocate available resources. There was a need to institute a cyclical planning process utilizing a common framework and definition which clearly delineated responsibilities within the process, and which improved the capacity of governmental agencies to carry out each element of the process. | The Executive Planning Process fulfilled this element of the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES PLACEMENTS

During the first year of the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project, most of the work activities initiated were geared toward interagency concerns at the State level. However, for the concept of planning capacity building to be effectively tested, it was thought valuable to involve a single agency in a more deliberate way. DSP was also interested in developing techniques which would aid human services planning acapacity building. Therefore, it was decided to place a planner within a function agency to work towards three goals:

- To help the agency apply planning techniques and procedures to its own internal planning process;
- To serve as a liaison to the staff of the Human Services Project;
- To identify problems and solutions to planning problems which might assist other functional agencies.

Discussions were held with the Departments of Health and Mental Hygiene, Public Safety and Correctional Services, and Human Resources to determine the best candidate agency for the placement planner. The Department of Human Resources (DHR) was selected because they had expressed an interest in obtaining the place-

ment planner, there was a need to integrate and improve DHR's three internal planning systems, and an existing planning structure (the Office of Program Planning and Evaluation) had been established. Recognizing the need to strengthen the coordinative relationship between DSP and the Office of Program Planning and Evaluation (OPPE) at the Department of Human Resources, this agency was then chosen as the site for a two-year placement.

In August of 1975, a planner was jointly hired by DSP and DHR. In April 1976, this planner was promoted to a permanent position within OPPE and then a second planner was selected to continue the HSP&CP activities at DHR. Since both planners had different work programs, they will be discussed separately.

First Year Placement Planner

The focus of the first year of the placement was to increase the planning capacity of local departments of social services through the utilization of existing DHR planning and evaluation activities and instruments - the Program Planning and Evaluation System (PPES), a program planning and budgeting system designed to meet internal decision making needs; the Executive Planning Process (EPP); and the State Social Services Plan (Title XX).

The basic strategy followed to achieve the above objectives hinged on using the existing PPES and related planning processes of the Office of Program Planning and Evaluation of DHR as the instruments for capacity building. As envisioned in the original work plan, the Planning and Evaluation Specialist (DHR Placement Planner) contributed to this increase in capability through the following activities:

(1) Act as a Personal Link Between OPPE and Local Departments

This linkage function improved communication between the two levels of government. State requests were interpreted and explained in much greater detail than had been possible through written communications. Local concerns and needs were conveyed to those at the State level where appropriate corrective action could be taken.

- (2) Assist OPPE and State Social Service and Income Maintenance Staff to Integrate Existing Planning Processes, so as to Coordinate the Requests of Local Departments of Social Services

Greater local participation required that local departments have adequate time and instructions for preparing their submissions. It further required that the requests from State staff of local departments were not duplicative nor overwhelming in their scope and detail. Thus, the furtherance of local capacity required that the responsible State staff take the time to clearly define what was needed from local departments. This effort also contributed to better outputs (greater capacity) at the State level, as improved scheduling of local inputs gave State staff more time and improved information for their planning activities.

- (3) Provide Specific Training and Technical Assistance in Planning and Evaluation to Local Departments

This activity was designed specifically to build up local planning and evaluation capacity. Workshops and training sessions on topics of interest to all departments, particularly as related to completing local PPES submissions and the use of products of the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project of DSP, were conducted with local staff through regional meetings. Individual technical assistance was provided to departments where special and unique problems were identified, particularly around issues of evaluating service effectiveness and improving the planning capacity within local jurisdictions.

- (4) Assist OPPE and State Social Service and Income Maintenance Staff to Increase their Capacity to Provide Ongoing Technical Assistance to the Local Departments

As the duration of this project was limited, it was important that those staff who would be available in the future to carry out this capacity building process be involved in all the training and technical assistance activities outlined above.

The foregoing objectives were based on several assumptions: that "capacity building" was most effective when related to existing real life activities, rather than being some kind of add-on activity; that existing planning processes - PPES, EPP, Title XX - reached the target population which the project sought to expose to planning and evaluation techniques; i.e., staff of local departments of social services and State Social Services Administration and DHR staff involved in planning and evaluation activities; and finally, that existing planning processes, if properly and fully implemented, would necessitate relating local DSS concerns to a broader human services planning context. The successful outcome of the first year of the project confirmed the initial validity of these assumptions.

The cornerstone of the first year's project was to link the capacity building activities with the PPES and related planning activities of OPPE. The first year work plan consisted of six phases:

- (1) Development of a detailed first year work plan;
- (2) Analysis of planning processes and development of training and related planning and evaluation materials;
- (3) Training and technical assistance to local departments of preparing local PPES submissions;
- (4) Training and technical assistance to State staff in the analysis and interpretation of the local PPES submission, with continued training and technical assistance to local departments, as requested;
- (5) Feedback to local departments of the results of the above analysis with training and technical assistance on utilization of the results for local management purposes; and
- (6) Evaluation of the project and preparation of the final report.

In conjunction with OPPE staff, an analysis was conducted of the existing planning processes in order to simplify and to coordinate their requests for inputs from local departments. A timetable was developed which gave local departments adequate time to prepare their submissions and State staff adequate time to analyze local inputs and to prepare Statewide plans. The characteristics, requirements and deadlines of Title XX, EPP and PPES were examined to determine whether a single local submission would suffice for all of these products, or whether some form of staged submissions would be either necessary or desirable. State Social Services and Income Maintenance staff were also involved at the appropriate time in this process of analysis.

Based on the results of the above assessment of the current planning process, the Planning and Evaluation Specialist worked with OPPE staff to revise and refine the PPES Guidance Manual for local departments. The Manual explained the nature

of the three planning requirements, explained how local inputs would be included in each, and set forth the requirements, procedures, and schedule for local submissions. The development of the Manual included collaboration with the State Social Services and Income Maintenance staffs who were, along with the Specialist, involved in providing technical assistance to local departments. The Guidance Manual was then sent to local departments. Regional meetings with local directors and staff were held by the Specialist along with OPPE and State Social Services and Income Maintenance staffs to introduce and explain the material.

After the introduction of the Guidance Manual, the next phase of the project involved organizing workshops and providing technical assistance to assist individual and/or groups of local departments in the preparation of their local submissions. A number of alternative methods of providing assistance were utilized. Formal instructional material on the PPES and related DSP materials was developed and made available to local departments. Less formal training and technical assistance were also provided to departments which had identified specific planning or programmatic issues.

The next step in the process involved working with Social Services, Income Maintenance and OPPE staff in the analysis of local plan submissions and the preparation of Statewide plans. The contact with local departments made by the Placement Planner during the preparation of local submissions enabled him to interpret the local submissions to the OPPE and SSA staff. Technical assistance and training in selected planning and evaluation activities with local departments were also continued during this phase of the project.

The next phase of the project involved feeding back to local departments, and interpreting for them the results of the foregoing process of analysis and State plan preparation, and assisting local departments in utilizing the above results in their management processes. State OPPE, Social Services and Income

Maintenance staffs were also involved in this process, as they had responsibility for the monitoring and evaluation activities based on these Statewide plans.

The final step in the project involved an evaluation of the planning and evaluation capacity building effort, with specific recommendations for follow up activities. The evaluation included a narrative of the project, an assessment of its impact on increasing local capacity, a discussion of the problems encountered and a set of recommendations to guide future efforts. These last steps of the first year project were partially completed by the Placement Planner prior to his moving from the contract to a permanent position as Assistant Director, OPPE. Initial feedback to local departments as well as a preliminary evaluation of the planning process and activities completed during the earlier stages of the contract were completed and distributed to DHR management and to DSP staff.

Second Placement Planner

In July 1976, a second planner was brought aboard at DHR. The tasks listed in the work program for the first planner had been accomplished or would be completed by the planner in his new position. With the employment of the second placement planner, new problems were facing DHR -- preparation of the Title XX Plan and the need to strengthen data usage in their Executive Plan. For these reasons and because the new planner had experience in data/needs assessment, the focus of the placement changed in three crucial ways. Rather than concentrating on assistance to local departments of social services, the planner emphasized technical aid to State-level personnel. Instead of working on refining a planning process as a whole, the planner highlighted a few particular areas; in this case, data development and needs assessment. And lastly, rather than providing technical assistance primarily in planning, the person hired worked on projects in the fields of research and evaluation.

The work plan agreed upon by DHR and DSP detailed activities centering around six broad areas. These were, in order of priority:

- (1) Development of needs assessment methodologies;
- (2) Development of data resources;
- (3) Implementation of the Social Services Reporting System (SSRS);
- (4) Technical assistance on matters relating to local departments;
- (5) Utilization of DSP data by DHR; and
- (6) Coordination of local human service delivery systems.

As the year progressed, certain of these activities were no longer pursued for a variety of reasons. For example, technical problems with the reporting system (SSRS) delayed its timetable for implementation, thereby limiting involvement on the part of the planner. Therefore, by the end of the contract, data and needs assessment, broadly defined, were clearly the two areas in which the planner concentrated her efforts.

Within this framework, the second planner worked on a variety of projects:

(1) Needs Assessment

In the past, the needs of the population in the area of social services had largely been determined by asking social service professionals to identify problems. To introduce a more objective element into DHR's planning process, a needs assessment was conducted emphasizing analysis of administrative and external data. These data provided a picture of populations in need of service, problems, barriers, etc. and were also used to re-evaluate the information gathered from the survey of service providers completed during the previous year. Elements of this needs assessment were then incorporated into DHR's Title XX Social Services Plan, as well as the Department's Executive Plan.

Additionally, a notebook was assembled to be used as a reference source on needs assessment for OPPE. The notebook contained data tables, a bibliography of sources consulted, directions for performing certain kinds of projections, etc. Also, based on the experience gathered from doing the needs assessment and a thorough review of literature on techniques for conducting one, suggestions (in the form of outlines) were made to OPPE on what was feasible for the Department to accomplish in this area during the next planning cycle and subsequently over the long run, in terms of a comprehensive effort.

(2) Cecil County

The second planner became a member of the Cecil County Planning Task Force. (For more information on Cecil County, see p. 95). But this planner's scope of activities relative to the Task Force was decidedly different than the first planner's, since it was oriented towards needs assessment. In the beginning, the planner participated as a Task Force member by attending meetings, completing additional analysis of the Cecil County Human Services Inventory, providing input into the progress report submitted to the Council of Social Agencies and the County Commissioners, locating DHR administrative data relative to services in the County, and giving general technical assistance in planning. However, when the Task Force hired a full time staff person, the planner's emphasis shifted to the issue of using the Task Force as a model for obtaining local input into DHR's planning process. The creation of the subcommittee structure provided opportunity to do this. The planner became the chairperson of the subcommittee on needs assessment for which two goals were established: to provide Cecil County with a clearer picture of its problems and to design a strategy for the county to communicate identified needs to the State. At the same time, in light of DHR's two years of experience in Cecil County, this planner also formulated a list of recommendations to State DHR personnel on substate participation in the planning process.

(3) Income Data

It was recognized by DHR that there existed a large gap in its data base used for planning in the area of family income projections. Such information was important on two counts: to estimate the number of persons eligible for services based on income and to help in the setting of program fee scales. The second planner helped DHR to articulate its needs for this data and translated them to DSP. DSP has now made its household income projections developed for the housing element available to DHR. In addition, DSP has provided the planner with instructions for breaking the figures down by family size, should DHR decide to commit the time and manpower necessary to go this extra step.

(4) Field Assessments of Local Social Services Offices

Although evaluations of local departments were required, no standardized methodologies existed for doing them, and no performance standards had been set against which to measure a local department's performance. Therefore, technical assistance was given to the field staff of the Social Services Administration (the service-delivery arm of DHR) in clarifying its role in evaluation within the Department, defining the unique types of questions the unit was looking to answer about local offices, designing data collection instruments, and using socio-demographic data to help interpret field assessment findings.

(5) Adoption Study

This planner assisted with a study designed to gauge the impact of a particular legislative remedy on the efficacy of one social

service program. Help was provided on how evaluation might feed into needs assessment. It was felt that this study could serve as a model to test how evaluation and needs assessment could be related if meaningful cooperation and two-way feedback between the State level and local departments were generated.

(6) Day Care

The Planner acted as the contact point within DHR for comments on a model designed by the Baltimore City Department of Planning to assess the need for pre-school day care in Baltimore City (See p. 85).

(7) In-House Activities

The planner was also engaged in a variety of data-related inhouse activities and served as a resource person on data needs and uses, filling information requests both from within and outside of DHR.

Through placing a planner at the Department of Human Resources, several valuable lessons were learned. In general, it was discovered that the following three characteristics should be present within an agency for a placement to be successful:

- (1) Agency decision makers who are committed to the improvement of the agency's short and long range planning capabilities.
- (2) A planning office which deals with policy issues and is not solely concerned with line item budgeting.
- (3) Existence of an organized planning process.

The success of the project is not, however, assured even if an agency is carefully chosen based on the three criteria above. Much depends on the skills of the planner in two important areas. The first is avoiding the pitfall of personalization. Particularly in regard to coordination and liaison activities, the planner may be viewed as the focal point rather than the unit or department for which he/she works. If this is the case, the contact is not institutionalized and once the project terminates, the contact is lost.

A second problem facing the planner which may jeopardize the success of the project is that of judging how much distance to maintain from the host agency. On the one hand, the planner wants to be an "insider" in order to gain acceptance

and earn legitimacy among his/her co-workers so that he/she is in a position to effect changes. On the other hand, the planner must retain an objective viewpoint about what needs to be changed, and also be able to judge which work assignments are inappropriate to the goals of the project. It is all too easy to become too thoroughly assimilated into the unit for which one is working.

There are other considerations to be taken into account when placing a planner within a functional agency. The first is that the agency will benefit most by matching its needs to the abilities of the incumbent individual within the boundaries of the goals of the project. When such a placement is considered, usually a large number of possible work activities are identified. An agency stands to gain the most from a placement if the individual selected to fill the position can choose from those activities identified by the agency and can suggest his/her own ideas. In other words, the work plan should be married to an individual rather than an individual to a pre-determined work plan. As a corollary to this point, the work plan should be used as a point of departure. Because of time constraints, contingency factors, etc. the direction of a project can drastically change, as evidenced by DHR's experience in hiring two planners. Therefore, the work plan should be used flexibly, as a guidepost, rather than as a contract between the planner and the agency. Experience with these kinds of work plans shows that they are generally quite ambitious in conception -- implementation is usually on a much smaller scale.

The project can be credited with certain tangible achievements both from DHR's and DSP's vantage points. From DHR's point of view, the improvements have moved the agency further along a self-chosen path and have provided a momentum for continuation of the type of activities begun under the HSP&CP. From the DSP perspective, the accomplishments have clearly been in the areas that the Project was designed to improve, namely, planning coordination and capacity building.

The first group of achievements that can be credited to the project fall into the area of substantive improvements in DHR's planning process. Paramount among these are the innovations incorporated into the planning process itself and the new appreciation of the uses of data for planning. First, the project took a planning-programming-budgeting model and tailored it to reflect the needs not only of State-level personnel making allocation-type decisions, but also of local-level staff involved in direct client contact. As a result, a cumbersome process perceived as a burden by local departments was scaled down and transformed into one useful tool for planning at both levels.

Second, the project injected a new awareness at DHR of data resources beyond what the agency collects on its own. New techniques and skills were incorporated into agency planning. Indeed, the needs assessment completed for the FY 78 planning cycle represented a significant first step toward achieving the comprehensive needs assessment now envisioned by the Department. Together, the streamlined planning process and the new appreciation for data both served to reinforce the planning perspective within a planning unit formerly geared toward budgeting.

The second group of achievements which can be attributed to the project include procedural improvements in DHR's planning. The fact that the first planner was hired as a permanent staff member in OPPE indicated that a planning perspective was given credibility and legitimacy within the Department. In addition, at the urgings of both the first and second planners, OPPE hired a statistical assistant, someone to assist with data analysis on a permanent basis. Also, OPPE is seriously considering the institutionalization of substate input into its planning process and the establishment of a Title XX unit to provide permanent staff support to needs assessment and local public participation.

• The third area of accomplishment is that of liaison with DSP. Through the placements, DSP has become more aware of the problems functional agencies have. In addition, the two agencies are cooperating on a variety of projects including the aforementioned income projections, Cecil County Planning Task Force, etc. and possibilities of automating the HWC State Resource File. Plans are being formulated for continuing the close cooperation between the two agencies.

The first two sections of this chapter described two specific technical assistance projects. However, Human Resource staff also provided more general types of assistance on ongoing basis. These activities will be described in the next section.

PLANNING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE AGENCIES

It is sometimes difficult to distinguish interagency coordination activities from technical assistance. Frequently, staff will review plans or draft reports as part of their participation on various interagency committees. Further, staff will offer their planning expertise when needed by these committees. In addition to the technical assistance activities which relate to committee participation, other types of technical assistance duties performed by the Human Resources staff cluster under the headings of Clearinghouse reviews, working with the Capital Improvements Division, and responding to special requests.

The State Clearinghouse, which is responsible for A-95 reviews, is located within the Department of State Planning. Each human resources planner is responsible for reviewing A-95 projects in his appropriate functional planning area. (A-95 refers to those projects which are submitted to the State Clearinghouse under the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-95. Staff review such projects to see that adequate coordination has occurred and review them

for duplication with other projects.) Staff may be responsible for contacting the applicant in order to resolve problems and questions and may occasionally contact reviewers in other State agencies to discuss applications.

Another Clearinghouse responsibility is the review of surplus State land. By law, any State property which is declared surplus or is determined to be no longer needed, must be reviewed by the State Clearinghouse. The reason for this is to determine whether another State agency could utilize the property.

Staff also provide technical assistance to the Capital Improvements Division. This assistance includes reviewing master facilities plans and reviewing bond bills. For example, staff have reviewed the criminal justice and health master plans. Human Resources staff also serve as advisors to the Capital Improvements Division during the preparation of the Capital Budget. Staff analyze budget requests, attend hearings and site visits and review legislative requests which deal with capital facilities. Similarly, planners are sometimes requested to review Board of Public Works' Agenda items.

Staff are also asked to respond to special requests such as assisting other State agencies in providing information, reviewing State plans, or in preparing grant applications. For example, the staff social services planner comments on the Title XX plan prepared by the Department of Human Resources and reviewed the State Domiciliary Care Plan. Staff also assist other State agencies in their planning efforts. For example, staff have worked with the State 4-C Committee and the Governor's Commission on Children and Youth in developing needs assessment methodologies. Many agencies often use staff as an information resource to help in their data collection efforts or to help identify potential funding sources. Recently, the Department of State Planning's health planner assisted the data director of the State Health Planning Agency in locating census data,

socio-economic data, and in collecting state population characteristics and projections needed for the State Health Plan.

The types of planning and technical assistance provided by the Department of State Planning are broad and varied in nature. The following list. was prepared in order to give an overview of the types of technical assistance activities performed by the Human Resources staff.

Technical Planning Assistance Activities

- A-95 Reviews - Education, health, criminal justice, elderly, nutrition, manpower, housing, economic and community development, social services.
- Provide guidance to Interagency Committee for Planning and Budgeting of Aging Services.
- Review and comment on Title XX Plan.
- Provide technical assistance on data collection and needs assessment for Title XX Plan.
- Review master facilities plans for Health and Mental Hygiene, criminal justice and higher education.
- Surplus property reviews.
- Capital Improvements - review proposals, attend hearings, and site visits in the areas of health, criminal justice and education.
- Review Board of Public Works agenda items.
- Review bond bills.
- Respond to special informational requests.
- Provide assistance to jail capital fund applicants.
- Liaison with Maryland Community College Research Group.
- Liaison with State Advisory Council on Vocational-Technical Education MSDE.
- Technical planning assistance to the Division of Vocational-Technical Education, MSDE.
- Technical planning assistance to the State Board for Higher Education on higher education Master Plan.
- Planning assistance to MSDE Advisory Council on Facilities for the Handicapped.
- Planning assistance to the Division of Special Education, MSDE.
- Provide guidance in senior citizen multi-purpose centers.

V. PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL AND REGIONAL AGENCIES

This section of the case study is organized around major areas of technical assistance provided to local and regional planning agencies. These included planning assistance to Baltimore City, Montgomery County, the Regional Planning Council, Cecil County, and the Health and Welfare Council of Central Maryland. The Guidance Manual, because of its general applicability, is discussed as a separate item.

Even before the receipt of Federal Partnership funds to support the HSP&CP, the staff of the Human Resources Section provided technical assistance to local and regional planning bodies. It was not uncommon for the staff to answer questions from local functional planners about available data sources for their present planning project -- an Area Agency on Aging Annual Plan, a block grant application for housing assistance, etc. Responding to these requests was rarely a time consuming effort and was not considered to be technical assistance of any appreciable magnitude. This work was basically of an ad-hoc nature; staff would respond to specific requests on an as-needed basis.

The first year's work program of the Project reflected increased attention to the provision of technical assistance to local jurisdictions. Built into that work program was a "local test" of the HSP&CP in Baltimore City. Its purpose was to subcontract with the City Planning Department to test at the local level the utility of the AS/TP Classification System and other methodologies developed by the State Project. Technical assistance was also provided to Montgomery County; that activity changed to coordination and information-sharing around specific Project activities. It was the technical assistance provided to a locally based planning group in Cecil County that led to a significant redirection of attention in the FY 77 work program towards assisting localities. By the HSP&CP's third year, the production of a guidance manual for counties in comprehensive human resources planning was a single work item, reflecting the importance of this area.

BALTIMORE CITY LOCAL TEST

During the Fall of 1974, the Department of State Planning and the Baltimore City Department of Planning agreed that they had a common interest in human services planning and coordination. The Department of State Planning was also interested in learning whether or not portions of the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project would be applicable to local jurisdictions. DSP felt there was a strong need for a local test because of the large part the political sub-divisions play in the delivery of human services in Maryland. In some instances, the local governments not only administer service delivery programs but also contribute to their financial support. In order for the work done by the Department of State Planning to have validity and utility, it must be applicable at both the State and local levels.

While any number of counties could have been chosen as a local test site, Baltimore City seemed to be the most appropriate. The City had shown an active interest in the Project along with developing their own expertise in planning and service delivery. A meeting was held (October 21, 1974) with members of the City Planning Department and the Mayor's Office of Human Resources to discuss the feasibility of testing the concepts developed by the Human Services Project. Baltimore City had had some interest in pursuing human services planning but had been unable to fund all the projects they deemed necessary; thus, an arrangement between State Planning and City Planning seemed to be desirable. By contractual agreement, City Planning was to receive a grant for conducting a specific needs study based on concepts developed by the Human Services Project.

The Department of State Planning and Baltimore City Department of Planning jointly developed a contract stating the responsibilities of each during a five

month test period. Further description of the actual work products the City Department of Planning was responsible for were outlined in a scope of services document.

The project was designed to test the usefulness of specific information and techniques which had been developed by the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project. The Department of State Planning was particularly interested in testing the Activity Sector/Target Population Matrix which had been developed at the very beginning of the Project. The AS/TP Matrix was designed to examine the State services and population characteristics as well as to classify the information that was collected. Improving health and day care services for pre-school children was the demonstration activity area chosen for the test. As part of the test, Baltimore City Planning sought to improve coordination of services, particularly between State and local governments while at the same time identifying service gaps and duplications. The Department of State Planning-City Planning relationship was also intended to identify policy-making, planning and coordination responsibilities at the local and State levels, and to offer recommendations to State Planning regarding the relationship between State and local planning activities.

Human Resources staff served in an advisory capacity during the contractual period with City Planning. HSP&CP staff had monthly meetings with the active project participants from Baltimore City. Staff also performed a monitoring function by reviewing progress reports sent by City Planning. This function enabled staff to foresee that Baltimore City was not going to satisfy the work program punctually. Human Resources staff also read drafts of the day care model and health needs assessment project papers and attempted to keep Baltimore City on target.

Results of the Baltimore City local test included several related reports:

1) "Day Care in Baltimore," 2) "Primary Care Health Services for Pre-School Children," 3) "The Relationship Between Health Services and Day Care Centers," 4) "Start-Up Costs of Operating a Primary Care Health Center," and 5) "Planning Process Recommendations." These reports were sent to the Maryland Department of Human Resources, the Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene and the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Ultimately, these papers were shared with other groups such as the Maryland Community Coordinated Child Care (4-C) Committee, the Maryland Committee for the Day Care of Children and a special State legislative task force studying the provision of day care services in Maryland.

The day care study was considered a major product of the local test. This paper addressed itself to determining the need for day care services in an urban setting, using a low-income areas of the City as their model. Most of the findings and the model were based upon a literature review of other studies. A small, informal survey was also conducted. It addressed some general problems in providing day care services which are applicable Statewide; however, the utility of the needs assessment model was limited to urban areas.

The health services study for pre-school children was basically an inventory and description of existing services for this population. This paper estimated the level of service that should be available. Two of the other studies completed as part of the local test tie into this "Primary Health Services for Pre-School Children" report. First came the "Start-Up Costs" paper in September 1975. This paper addressed existing grants for developing health services and what other monies would be required to develop adequate health centers. The second, related study released in March 1976 addressed the need for coordinating health services for pre-

schoolers with day care programs. It discussed the negative attitudes day care administrators faced in developing a coordinated service system. The paper advocated comprehensive service availability to pre-school children.

A brief section of the local test report entitled "Planning Process Recommendations" discussed Baltimore City Planning perceptions of the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project. They believed that the AS/TP concept was a valid one, but in order for it to be useful, it is necessary to prepare an annual report of State human services in the AS/TP Matrix framework. In conjunction with the AS/TP study, Baltimore City sought additional information on needs assessment. Most importantly, Baltimore City stressed that State Planning could best help localities by offering technical assistance in study design and systems development techniques, as well as needs assessment studies that could be easily incorporated into local service systems. (Interestingly enough, this was the approach taken in the Cecil County project discussed later in this Chapter).

Discussion of the local test with Baltimore City began in September 1974. After several meetings, a contract for the local test was signed in January 1975. From February through June, Baltimore City was expected to perform an inventory of existing facilities, identify service delivery problems and develop a model to determine the need for services. The work took the City four months longer than originally anticipated; this delay was attributable to internal staffing problems.

The Department of State Planning, in cooperation with the Department of Human Resources, has been reviewing the Day Care Model developed by City Planning to ascertain its applicability Statewide. Concurrently, a special State legislative task force reviewing day care has also been judging the model's applicability Statewide. The task force will be recommending in their final report that further study is needed in the area of day care needs assessment statewide. The Maryland

4-C Committee will be utilizing the Baltimore City report during the 1977-78 year in order to develop strategies and criteria for family day care needs in Maryland.

Human Resources staff attempted to bring the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene together with Baltimore City planners who worked on the health care needs of pre-schoolers aspect of the local test to discuss possible implementation. City Planning was reluctant to continue their participation in the test after the contractual period had ended, and thus, no further follow up of the health studies occurred.

One of the most successful outcomes of this project was that it provided the impetus for Baltimore City Planning to apply for their own HEW Partnership Grant. They requested funds to develop a more detailed system to collect, inventory, and analyze information about human services programs offered by the City. Recently, several meetings have been held to discuss the similarities and complementarity of the Baltimore City System and DSP's Activity Sector/Target Population Classification System. The goal of these meetings was to develop compatible taxonomies for inventorying human service programs.

MONTGOMERY COUNTY

The Human Services Task Force served as a vehicle through which local governments and planning bodies became aware of the HSP&CP. The Director of the Montgomery County Office of Human Resources (OHR) was a member of the Task Force. OHR was interested in developing a local resource allocation project that could serve as a base for planning and budgeting decisions regarding the provision of human services. Montgomery County had previously expressed interest in the Department's AS/TP matrix because it provided a clear and concise way of presenting service information. The HSP&CP Coordinator met with the assistant director of OHR and shared some of the developmental history and rationale for the AS/TP. Montgomery County reviewed the AS/TP, and with relatively few changes adapted that State developed matrix for local use.

Work then progressed towards the resource allocation project. The level of detail of information that the County was interested in obtaining and analyzing differed greatly from DSP's need for aggregated service information. OHR's staff are competent professionals who devoted full time attention to this project. It had become apparent that their work was becoming both detailed and highly sophisticated. The technical assistance that DSP once provided soon became a mutual sharing of information (problems encountered, solutions, etc.) between OHR and DSP as they each worked on their own projects. This staff-to-staff sharing which began in 1975 continues today. Learning about the experiences of Montgomery County as they developed both a resource inventory and social indicators project (modeled after DSP projects in this area) helped to sensitize the DSP staff to the unique problems and perspectives of locally based comprehensive human resources planning.

REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL (RPC)

Like Montgomery County and Baltimore City, the Regional Planning Council (RPC) was represented on the Human Services Task Force. RPC is a metropolitan planning agency with representation from the following jurisdictions: Baltimore City, Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Carroll, Harford and Howard Counties. The agency has authority for regional planning responsibilities in certain human service areas, including criminal justice and public safety, library services, cultural arts, aging services, and until the formation of the Health Systems Agencies, health planning.

Planning and technical assistance to the Regional Planning Council has centered on several major work activities -- a regional coalition project to coordinate services to handicapped children, the review of regional health plans and guidance regarding preparation of the General Development Plan and the development of a regional plan for domiciliary care.

The coalition project was an attempt to develop new models of coordination at both the regional and local levels to improve the delivery of services to handicapped children. Public, private, and advocacy agencies were involved in a consultative capacity throughout this project.

DSP noted the coalition had not coordinated its planning activities with 43 known local programs and because of this, reviewed the project (through A-95) unfavorably. DSP is credited by the director of the Developmental Disabilities Council with having taken a needed and courageous stand on this issue. The project shows that Partnership Projects can and should act in areas where there is program duplication and lack of coordination.

The Department of State Planning reviewed the "Areawide Plan for Health" prepared by RPC before the formation of the Central Maryland Health Systems Agency. Developmental guidance was offered throughout the planning process and written comments were prepared upon receipt of the Plan. Additionally, there were several follow-up meetings with the RPC Health Planning staff. The Plan for Long-Term Care was also critically reviewed. A Human Resources Section staff member served on an advisory committee that helped to develop a regional plan for domiciliary care. This advisory committee, composed of State and local agency representatives, helped to assure that the findings and recommendations offered in that report were valid and acceptable. This domiciliary care study later served as the guide for all subsequent work in this area.

RPC has requested DSP's participation on a number of committees that have been charged with the review of elements of their General Development Plan (GDP). Human Resources staff were members of advisory committees for the human resources, housing, and economic development elements of the GDP. In addition, the Division Director of Comprehensive Planning served on an advisory committee that guided the overall preparation of the GDP. The human resources element calls for

strengthened coordination among human service planning agencies in the region, so it is expected that DSP and RPC will continue to work together on a variety of projects in the future.

HEALTH AND WELFARE COUNCIL

The Central Maryland Health and Welfare Council (HWC) is the planning and research arm of the United Way of Central Maryland. Their Executive Director was an original member of DSP's Human Services Task Force. The relationship between these two agencies is a long and steady one. It began when DSP contracted with HWC to prepare a report on voluntary services in Maryland, which is discussed in a subsequent section of this case study. That activity took place during the first year of Maryland's HSP&CP and helped to set the stage for continued coordination. DSP recognized the unique role HWC occupied by having ready access to voluntary sector service information which has been an information gap for the State. HWC and DSP have worked cooperatively on a variety of projects, all pertaining to the production and distribution of information about human services in the State and region.

During the second year of the HSP&CP, the HWC became involved in the development of BASIS -- the Baltimore Area Services Identification System. BASIS was a regionally-adapted and simplified version of the United Way of America's Service Identification System (UWASIS). BASIS was prepared under the "joint sponsorship of the Baltimore City Department of Planning and the HWC of Central Maryland," and is designed to "meet each agency's need for a service classification system in separate but closely related endeavors in the area of human services planning -- the City's Human Services Reporting System and the Council's Needs and Services Analysis Programs," (Forward, BASIS, November 1976). Key staff from both of these agencies were identified as having lead responsibility for the project.

DSP was asked to be a review agent and to assist in all developmental aspects of BASIS. The Human Resources Section of DSP had already developed its own classification system (the AS/TP Matrix, described earlier in this report) and was interested in the applicability of AS/TP at the regional level. The AS/TP framework was purposely designed for the classification and categorization of State services, and as such, looks at services in a more aggregated manner than BASIS. HWC and DSP both recognized the potential complementarity of these efforts and agreed to work cooperatively. Human Resources Section staff reviewed several drafts of BASIS and proposed adaptations that were reflected in later versions.

BASIS was published in November 1976. DSP called a meeting that Spring (in the third and final year of the HSP&CP) of the Executive Director and key staff of HWC, Baltimore City Planning, and Montgomery County's Office of Human Resources to discuss the classification and inventory schemes these agencies had developed. That meeting was valuable because it offered all of these agencies the opportunity to discuss methodological problems or barriers encountered during their systems' design and the resolutions of these problems, areas of complementarity among the schemes, and present and intended utilization of the systems.

Although HWC and DSP had been exchanging copies of their monthly staff activities reports, that Spring meeting evidenced the value of joint staff meetings. Subsequently, planning staff from HWC and appropriate staff from DSP have met regularly to discuss pre-selected work activities in detail. There is a consensus that these meetings are extremely valuable and their continuation is planned for the next year.

An outgrowth of these joint staff meetings has been DSP's interest in automation of HWC's State Resource File. HWC regularly publishes a directory of all public and private human services offered throughout the State. The directory

is used primarily by information and referral workers, librarians, and counselors and contains valuable service information about service eligibility, geographic availability, hours of service, etc. This service information is collected and updated regularly. The information is collected and maintained manually and is known as the State Resource File. HWC is aware of the amorphous nature of the Resource File and is concerned about systematizing it. Automation of the file had long been a goal of HWC, but cost estimates were prohibitive.

DSP recognized the wealth of valuable information contained in the Resource File and also recognized that it duplicated program inventory data collection efforts (See p.145 for further information); the potential number and varieties of its use seemed limitless. Having all public and private service information contained in one place -- easily accessible by writing a single program (i.e., a request for a printout of all Statewide services for autistic children, an inventory of all services to the elderly in Garrett County, etc.) would be useful for planning purposes. However, HWC has no intentions of systematically analyzing the information in the file. HWC is primarily interested in collecting data so that their Directory of Community Services can be updated and published. Since DSP has computer capabilities, the Department is considering the possibility of automating and analyzing the State Resource File.

The Department has two other purposes in mind in considering assisting HWC in automating the State Resource File. The first is its desire to improve the data collection (and help to assure its accuracy) in possible updates of the Program Inventory. The second is a desire to supplement DHR's needs assessment efforts. The DSP placement planner at DHR had been responsible for preparation of that section of the Title XX Plan; she expressed a need for additional information, especially in the area of services provided by the voluntary sector.

DSP and DHR have had discussions to clarify their possible roles in this project and will be meeting with HWC to outline the steps involved in automation

of the File. It is expected that DSP will utilize some of its Human Resources Section staff and will also need to acquire additional expertise for completion of certain aspects of this work.

It is clear that the relationship with HWC has grown and been strengthened during the three years of the HSP&CP. Each agency's recognition of the nature and value of the other's work has helped to solidify the base upon which comprehensive human resources planning in the State and region is being accomplished.

CECIL COUNTY

Technical assistance to Cecil County by the Department of State Planning began in the summer of 1975. Informal discussions had begun in the County that Spring among several persons who perceived the need for the County to begin to think about (1) long range issues related to planning for human services and (2) the coordination and more efficient utilization of existing human services. These persons were members of the Cecil County Council of Social Agencies (CSA), a voluntary group of service agency representatives and interested citizens who met monthly to share information about their member agencies' services and programs. By May of 1975, the CSA gave approval to the formation of an ad hoc group on human services planning. The group was interested in developing a comprehensive/coordinated approach to human services planning but was uncertain as to how or where to begin. They contacted the Division of Urban Affairs of the University of Delaware and the Department of State Planning requesting assistance and guidance in their project.

A staff member from DSP attended the next meeting of the work group. This staff person first envisioned her role as a short-term consultant in the use of census and other data as related to the first stages of a planning process. The notion of this staff person's role changed within a short period of time. The work group has specific needs of the DSP representative. These included

assistance in designing the planning process, mobilization of resources and promotion of coordination of the involved members. It was also clear that DSP could play an important role in acting as liaison between Cecil County and other State human service agencies.

Assistance from the University of Delaware was also provided which focused on helping the planning group devise an appropriate questionnaire to send to agency representatives as the first step in a planning process. The questionnaire was designed to serve several purposes, to gain information about: (1) existing service agencies (clients, eligibility, hours, fees, etc.); (2) the extent of interaction between and among human service agencies (referrals, staff sharing, joint budgeting, etc.); and (3) agency staffs' and directors' perceptions of human needs in the County. Since DSP was an active participant in the work group by this time, the Department's representative helped to design the questionnaire form and consulted in other methodological areas.

The Spring and Summer of 1976 were spent in the design, implementation, and analysis of the questionnaire sent to County human service agencies. A cover letter was attached to all of the questionnaires from the President of the County Commissioners explaining the project and inviting agency participation. This personal note helped to elicit the cooperation of agencies who might otherwise not have taken the time to complete the questionnaire. The official County letterhead stationary served to make it an "official project." This questionnaire proved to be both too lengthy and too detailed for the purposes of the Cecil County project. It ran over 17 pages and for large County agencies, such as the local health department or department of social services, was extremely time consuming to complete. The questionnaire was mailed to 55 County service agencies. Forty-one responded and from the information contained in those questionnaires a study team from the University of Delaware produced an analysis

for the Task Force. This analysis was too lengthy and did not clearly provide a summary, recommendations, or strategies for future action. The report was then condensed into a shorter and simpler summary version and was mailed to all of the agencies who originally received copies of the questionnaire.

The results of the survey pointed to areas where a number of agencies were providing similar or complementary services. Based on this finding, it was recommended that communication links between agencies be strengthened so that referrals could be made more easily and regularly. Recommendations were also made in other areas, including the need for regular updating and publication of service data from agencies (a service directory); the need for a volunteer bureau to act as a clearinghouse or matching service between County residents and agency volunteer opportunities; and the general need to develop a coordinated and comprehensive planning process for human services in the County.

After embarking on this activity and beginning to think about other long range issues, the planning group recommended to the Council of Social Agencies that they become a working Task Force of that parent organization. The CSA endorsed this concept and the Task Force began to broaden its proposed work program beyond the agency questionnaire. Attention focused on the development of a coordinated approach to comprehensive human services planning in the County.

The Task Force realized the importance of gaining support from the County Commissioners for their work, and soon approached them with a detailed agenda of what they hoped to accomplish. It was the County Commissioners who had originally suggested that the Task Force become formally aligned with the County planning office for the purpose of conducting the agency survey.

The group envisioned itself preparing a supplement or addendum to the County Comprehensive Plan that would deal with broad areas of human services through the year 2000. A member of the Task Force was the director of the County plan-

ning office and he took an active interest in the planning project. His staff provided valuable secretarial and administrative support during the questionnaire/research period. However, this person soon took employment outside the County and with his departure went the interest and enthusiasm of the planning office in the project. After the completion of the questionnaire, the new County planning office director became an advisory or ex-officio member. This was unfortunate because the inclusion of the planning office lent a certain amount of credibility to the project in the eyes of the County Commissioners. Involvement of the planning office would have also helped to assure the integration of the work of the human services planning project with all other planning developments, either physical or economic, in the County.

DSP continued to provide assistance to the Task Force. The Department was highly supportive of this local planning project and began to realize its potential as a model for County input to the State Title XX (Social Services) Plan. For that reason, DSP with the approval of the Task Force, invited the placement planner at DHR to participate in the Cecil project.

Although considered members of the Task Force, the staff person from DSP and the placement planner from DHR were also viewed as technical consultants to the project. By the time the survey results were released (July 1976), support from the University of Delaware ceased. The Task Force then gave greater attention to the advice and guidance of the State "advisors." They requested that these two staff persons prepare a planning model or framework for future action. The State representatives saw this as an opportunity to produce a short paper which could activate Task Force members. That memorandum was prepared in August 1976. It outlined a number of alternative short and long range actions and strategies in which the Task Force could engage and then described similar planning projects in Howard and Montgomery Counties as

potential organizational models. It also emphasized the necessity of gaining governmental support for the project and expanding press coverage of the work of the Task Force so that the community could come to know and understand their efforts. The need for outside staff assistance was also recognized and the memorandum suggested that the Task Force might wish to work towards the appointment of a person to work solely in human services planning. On a final note, the memorandum cautioned the group against an over-emphasis on a product orientation (such as an addendum to the County Comprehensive Plan) to the detriment of the development of a planning process. The actual process of coordination is one of getting people regularly together to jointly work on problem resolution and to agree on common visions of the future. It is an ongoing activity, and in the long run, has far greater payoffs than the preparation of a single document. It was becoming increasingly clear that the lessons learned from the HSP&CP were being applied to the local project in Cecil County. DSP was concerned that this local project benefit from their own experiences at the State level. The delicate balance between a process and a product orientation was no less difficult to strike at the local level than at the State.

Meetings of the Task Force during the Fall of 1976 focused on ways in which the County comprehensive plan could be revised to reflect the impact of human services and social issues on long term growth and land use policies. The results of the resource inventory that had been prepared that Fall and Summer provided valuable information which could help to update the plan. (The County requires that the plan be reviewed by a citizen's committee and updated every two years.) Members of the Task Force and other knowledgeable persons in the County worked together and wrote a new section of the plan on community facilities and human services. The chairperson of the Council of Social Agencies advocated strongly the inclusion of these sections in the plan and they were accepted

and finally adopted in the new plan. The Task Force justifiably felt that they had succeeded in making the County government, and planning office in particular, more sensitive to the need for comprehensive human services planning. Without the Task Force, such an improvement would never have occurred; this represented a significant achievement in that the importance of planning for human services was recognized by the County Commissioners and the County Planning Commission.

It was during that same time (later Summer - Fall 1976) that the Department of State Planning became interested in supporting the work of a county interested in beginning or improving a comprehensive human resources planning process through the direct transfer to that jurisdiction a portion of the Maryland Partnership Grant. Although Cecil County appeared to be a likely candidate, the Department spoke with all of its regional planners (placed in 7 geographic areas of the State) to gain their assessment of which counties might be amenable to such an arrangement. The regional planners were quick to point to many counties where they thought there would be outright opposition to DSP's involvement. It was more difficult for them to recommend counties where they thought such a project would "work." It was learned that Kent County (located on the southern border of Cecil County) Council of Social Agencies had also recently begun a small human services planning project based on their A-95 review responsibility granted by their County Commissioners, and might also be a good candidate for financial assistance.

Similar letters were sent to the County Commissioners of Cecil and Kent Counties in early September 1976 explaining DSP's desire to financially assist their planning projects through the placement of a human resources planner half-time in each of these counties. Kent County quickly responded that they were not interested in this arrangement. Cecil County raised legitimate concerns about the nature of dual supervision (State/local) of the planner and the

County Commissioners also suggested that the human resources planner be hired to assist the Council of Social Agencies.

Because assisting the Council of Social Agencies had been the intent of the proposed project from its inception, the Department of State Planning and the Cecil County Council of Social Agencies began negotiations towards the transfer of funds so that the Council could hire a planner. The largest roadblock was the fact that the Council was an unincorporated body and unable to accept monies on their own behalf. It became necessary to find an "intermediary" agency who could act as a financial conduit to accept the project funds, keep the proper accounts, and pay the salary of the planner. Possibilities here included the Cecil County Community College (whose dean was a member of the Task Force), the Health and Welfare Council of Central Maryland (which would have to sub-contract with the Cecil County United Way Agency), and Maryland Children's Aid and Family Service Society (MCA&FSS), Inc. (which was the employing agency of the Task Force chairperson and had office space where the monthly Task Force meetings were being held). These agencies met with the Task Force at a meeting in December and it was determined that Maryland Children's Aid and Family Service Society would be the appropriate financial intermediary for the planning project. The staff director of that agency agreed to reallocate a portion of their counselor's time, who had been functioning as the chairperson of the Task Force, to allow her to devote more time and attention to the project and become its local monitor. Maryland Children's Aid and Family Services Society also was able to provide the office space for the local planner.

The development of a three-party (DSP, MCA&FSS & Cecil County Council of Social Agencies) contract was a difficult and time consuming endeavor. During the course of six weeks, various formats were suggested ranging from informal working agreements to formal contracts. The Task Force and DSP strongly

believed that the various roles and responsibilities of all the parties involved needed to be carefully delineated in the contract so as to avoid any misunderstandings in the future that could jeopardize the project. Besides meeting legal and fiscal requirements, the contract had to meet the approval of the Secretary of the Department of State Planning, the President of the Board of Maryland Children's Aid and Family Services Society, and the Chairperson of the Cecil County Council of Social Agencies. That contract was signed in early January 1977 by all three parties. The contract itself finally took the form of a simple two page document with four pages of appended explanatory material, including: (1) a description of the project; (2) a clarification of the roles and responsibilities of all major parties (including the planning specialist to be hired); (3) a description of the desired qualifications for the planning specialist; and (4) a scope of services for the planning specialist.

Advertisements for the human resources planning specialist were placed in newspapers in the Baltimore, Wilmington, Philadelphia, and Cecil County areas. The candidate selected was a doctoral student whose experience in human services was basically in evaluation work as a consultant in the areas of adult and juvenile justice. His academic program, however, emphasized organizational development and group process skills; these skills areas had been utilized in a variety of training programs he had developed and conducted. It was thought that these skills would help mobilize the Task Force into an action group and help the Task Force to draw upon their own expertise in human services, recognize their skills, and become more self-confident and able to function on their own.

The planning specialist began employment on April 1, 1977. As the contract stated, the planner is an employee of Maryland Children's Aid and Family Service Society (he receives his salary from that agency and is governed by their personnel policies); but as mentioned earlier, he receives direction and guidance from

the planning Task Force. At the completion of his contract period (April 1978), a full report of his activities will be submitted to HEW. While it was once envisioned that the Task Force might act in an advisory board capacity once the planner was hired, it became apparent that the Task Force had to remain an active working group. The Council of Social Agencies (the parent organization of the Task Force) more appropriately filled that advisory board role, approving all major activities and policies adopted by the Task Force.

In many ways, the Cecil County Planning project represents an "ideal" for the Partnership Program. It utilizes Federal funds, channeled through a State program, to a local agency composed of public and private service providers and the community.

Some valuable lessons can be highlighted from the Cecil County project. DSP specified its role in the planning process. The Department did not want to do the work of the Task Force, but wanted instead to provide the guidance and assistance necessary to enable individual members and the group as a whole to develop their own planning capabilities. It was important that the group develop its own leaders and not rely on DSP: this clearly happened as members took active roles in the Task Force and on other projects in the County (i.e., revision of the Comprehensive Plan). The memorandum that DSP and DHR wrote marked a critical time in the capacity building phase of the planning project. That memo suggested possible action strategies or "next steps" for the project, but made it clear that decisions must be made locally.

Finally, the Cecil project was able to benefit from some of the experiences and developmental aspects of the HSP&CP. The balance between a process or product orientation had been difficult to strike at the State level within the HSP&CP. Some of the project's lessons were shared with the Task Force so that they could shape the course of the Cecil project in an appropriate manner.

A GUIDEBOOK FOR HUMAN RESOURCES PLANNING

The idea of producing a guidebook that could assist local jurisdictions (primarily counties) in initiating a comprehensive human resources planning process was a direct outgrowth of the Department's role in the Cecil County project. That project was considered successful because of its special character; County public and private service agency representatives working together towards a coordinated and responsive human service delivery system. The model that it represented was one that DSP thought worthy of sharing with other counties. At the same time, the Department recognized the unique nature of each county in Maryland and knew that it would be inappropriate to expect the Cecil project to be replicated elsewhere. What the Department thought would be valuable was a guidebook or guidance manual that could serve to interest other counties in comprehensive human resources planning and present a basic framework in which that process could be initiated and sustained.

The staff person who had been providing the ongoing assistance to Cecil County was assigned the responsibility of preparing this guidebook. She prepared an outline for the guidebook which identified the major sections and described work activities. This outline was very helpful in organizing the guidebook and the contents of the final report did not significantly change from the original outline.

A literature search composed a large portion of the work activities. This research activity included the following: a thorough review of where the Maryland counties were in relation to human resources planning (who was doing what and how?), a review of basic human resources planning texts, articles, and other academic publications to determine their applicability to county-level comprehensive human resources planning, and a review of the publications of other bodies of government (national, State, regional, or local) on comprehen-

sive human resources planning, human resources development, or planning capacity building.

Many different groups of readers could benefit from such a guidance manual and it was difficult to decide that county elected officials would be the primary audience. However, it was also decided to distribute copies of the manual to county planners, service providers and other agencies interested in comprehensive human services planning.

The guidebook is composed of discrete sections that can be read independently or sequentially; it is not necessary to read through the whole document if one is only interested in certain sections. The guidebook uses a basic question as the title of a section (i.e., "Why Should Counties be Interested in Comprehensive Human Resources Planning?") and then follows with a summary page of major points (the "answers" to the question); these answers are then discussed in the narrative that follows in that section. The guide also delineates the roles and responsibilities of the various participants (local elected officials, service agency directors/staff, planning staff and interested citizens) in the planning process. It outlines the basic steps of the planning process or a "how to do it" description. The last section of the guidebook highlights current comprehensive human resources planning processes in selected counties of the State; this section illustrates three different models that counties might wish to draw upon for organizational aspects of their own planning processes.

The Department of State Planning utilized a consultant for a portion of the writing of the guidebook. A faculty member of the University of Maryland's School of Social Work and Community Planning, who was looking for experience in a human resources planning agency to augment his teaching activities and his academic experience in the education field, was hired as the consultant. Unfortunately, not all of the work products submitted by the consultant were satis-

factory. Because of the need for editing and additional writing, completion of the local guidance manual was delayed. Final corrections and editing occurred during the Summer and Fall of 1977 while the DSP graphics department worked on visual presentations of each section to serve as dividers in the guidebook.

Since the guidebook has not yet been circulated, the Department has not received any comments on this document. DSP is confident that the guidebook will serve the diverse needs of local elected officials, planners, human service representatives, and interested citizens in the counties of Maryland. The guidebook is designed to interest counties in comprehensive human resources planning by carefully discussing the benefits that could be derived by a county's participation in and commitment to the planning process. In a sense, one of its functions is to serve as a "PR" document that could raise counties' levels of consciousness about comprehensive human resources planning.

The staff of the Human Resources Section reviewed the guidebook, as well as key persons in the Department's Division of Local and Regional Planning. The planner in Cecil County also provided a technical review. Had time permitted (if the final draft had been completed and available earlier), it might have proved valuable to circulate the guidebook to a selected audience of local officials, planners, and human service agency representatives for their comments and opinions.

Evaluation plans are now being formulated so that the impact of the guidebook may be assessed. The Department is interested in learning whether or not it raised the level of interest of counties who were previously not involved in human resources planning and whether the guidance it offers is relevant and helpful. Such information will help to shape the nature of followup activities.

DSP is committed to a follow-up to the guidebook and has built such an activity into its FY 78 work program. This follow-up is likely to take several

forms: the guidebook and its contents will be shared with the Department's regional planners so that they may become more aware of human resources concerns and be able to offer assistance to local planning offices; training sessions may be conducted by the project manager at the regional level in comprehensive human resources planning and the use of the guidebook (on the general topic of human resources planning or any specific interest or point raised in the guidebook); short term technical assistance may be provided to single jurisdictions; or additional indepth material may be provided on any specific subject related to human resources planning if the need is expressed by enough interested jurisdictions.

VI: ISSUE PAPERS

An original and continuing focus of the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project has been the preparation of indepth studies on issues of special concern. Criteria for the selection of topics were developed and then issues assessed according to the criteria. The following criteria were selected:

- The topics should be interdepartmental matters -- not the province of one State agency
- The topics should be primarily of Statewide rather than of individual jurisdictional concern
- The topics should be manageable in scope and staff should have the capability to complete them
- Issues should be either of an administrative or service delivery nature; a mix is preferable
- The topics should deal with the revitalization and/or reordering of existing services and programs rather than the creation of new ones
- There should be some general agreement that the issue is a matter of concern and it is an issue of priority.

Topics for issue papers have come from a variety of sources: agency interviews, legislative requests, staff review of plans, participation on interagency committees, and as outgrowths of follow ups to previous issue papers. Six issue papers were prepared during the course of the HSP&CP on the subjects of deinstitutionalization, coordination, purchase of care, target group agencies, the transportation disadvantaged and education to work linkages.

Although DSP assumed responsibility for the research and writing of the papers, input from other agencies was usually obtained during the data gathering and analysis phases. Several mechanisms were used to gain this input, including the use of advisory panels, agency interviews, and agency review of the reports in draft stage.

The initial topics chosen were coordination and deinstitutionalization. Staff compiled a list of potential topics based on agency interviews previously conducted. From this list, the Human Services Task Force determined that these two issues merited attention. Highlights of these and the other four issue papers will be presented for the remainder of this Chapter.

DEINSTITUTIONALIZATION: PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES

Work first began on this report in January 1975, when DSP contracted with a student intern from the University of Maryland School of Social Work and Community Planning to prepare the report. However, work stopped on the report after only two months for several reasons: (1) The scope of the study was too broad to be manageable. Deinstitutionalization is a concept which encompasses a wide range of philosophical components including institutional reform, depopulation of institutions, alternative living arrangements, and prevention of inappropriate institutionalization. Also, deinstitutionalization is the policy of 13 different State agencies covering such areas as health, education, social services, criminal justice and aging; (2) DSP staff had not clearly defined the goal and purposes of the study.

Work resumed on the study in May. DSP hired a person with considerable planning experience who was familiar with Maryland. The deinstitutionalization (DI) planner prepared a preliminary outline and began a literature search. The purpose of the literature review was to find out about deinstitutionalization activities in other states, DI efforts at the Federal level, and to learn about successful community programs.

The U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) was also studying deinstitutionalization and had selected Maryland as a case study. Their focus was to study problems at the Federal level which hampered deinstitutionalization efforts at the

State and local levels with an emphasis on legal and managerial problems. After comparing the DSP preliminary outline with the GAO study design and survey instruments, and after meeting with the GAO staff, DSP identified several major DI issues which should be addressed but were not included in the GAO report. The DI planner also met with staff from the Governor's Office to clarify DSP's intentions, since the Governor's Office was coordinating the Maryland responses to GAO. The Secretary of State Planning also wrote to the Governor explaining the proposed study.

The next step was the review of State agency deinstitutionalization planning activities. The second set of Executive Plans were due in May 1975 and these 5 year plans proved to be a valuable resource for identifying deinstitutionalization activities. Each of the plans of the 13 State agencies involved in DI were reviewed and analyzed to determine the commitment to deinstitutionalization and to outline policies and programs.

After the analysis of State plans was completed, a questionnaire was developed to be used for interviewing State agency staff. It was also decided that agency input was needed to guide the study. An advisory task force was created, and an orientation meeting was held in July to discuss the DSP study outline and to identify specific issues of concern.

After a synthesis and discussion of all comments, it appeared that interest focused on three major categories which affect deinstitutionalization efforts: administrative problems, lack of supportive services in the community, and community relations problems. Therefore, the original outline was restructured in conformance with this emphasis. The last section of the outline on possible strategies or solutions was also the result of suggestions offered at the meeting.

Based on the draft questionnaire and suggestions from the task force meeting, a series of extensive interviews was conducted. Twenty-four interviews with representatives from State agencies, county planning offices, group home operators and local community groups were conducted.

During this time, another work activity was also being completed -- the inventory of community facilities. Each State agency was asked to provide the names and addresses of the community residences for which it was responsible. This information was compiled and then charted and mapped. The co-location of community residences demonstrated the lack of State agency coordination in the area of deinstitutionalization.

During the 1975 legislative session, the Maryland General Assembly passed House Joint Resolution (HJR) 55 -- Community Based Residences. This resolution requested a commission be established to study the development of community residences as an alternative to institutionalization. Since community residences were the focal point of DSP's study, the legislative staff was contacted to promote early coordination of both activities. After reviewing the DSP study design, the Legislative Committee decided not to hold public hearings on this issue and requested that DSP present the findings of its report at a special hearing.

The hearing was scheduled for September 16, 1975, and by that time a "Preliminary Draft for Discussion Purposes" had been prepared. The presentation was well received and support was voiced for the report's key recommendation that an interagency policy and coordinating committee be established. Copies of DSP's testimony were sent to the Lieutenant Governor, Governor's Office staff, and interested agencies.

After the DI planner left State Planning at the end of September, revisions on the draft report progressed slowly. Each interviewed agency received a draft copy and was requested to verify the information pertaining to them. Considerable efforts were devoted to making the revisions subsequently suggested or in justifying

the information presented. During Christmas, the DI planner briefly rejoined the DSP staff and it was decided to hold another meeting of the DI task force. A second revised draft was distributed to the task force with the request that it be carefully reviewed prior to the meeting. A draft of the GAO deinstitutionalization study had also been prepared by this time and was also an agenda item for the task force meeting.

In addition to the task force, the draft report was widely circulated to State agencies, community planning representatives and other DSP divisions in January 1976. A large number of review responses were received, and in general, the comments supported the conclusions of the study. However, as a result of specific comments, it was again necessary to take time to revise the draft to accommodate these concerns. After final corrections and editing, the report was released in June 1976.

An extensive mailing list for copies of the report had been developed during the course of its preparation. In addition, the final report, Deinstitutionalization Problems and Opportunities, was sent to Cabinet Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries, representatives of the Legislature, community groups and the Governor. Approximately 500 copies were sent out.

Follow-Up

DSP follow-up began before the final report was released. In November 1975, DSP reviewed the GAO draft and shared its comments with the Governor's Office.

The response to the DI final report was quite favorable and the Human Resources staff decided to work on implementing the recommendations. This was included as a work activity in the third year work program under the heading of "coordination activities."

In July 1976, the DSP Secretary sent a memorandum to the Governor pointing out the parallel findings of the GAO and DSP deinstitutionalization studies. The memo indicated that a three-tiered coordination procedure would overcome many of the coordination barriers noted in both reports, and requested the Governor to convene an ad hoc task force.

Interest was also expressed in implementing the report by the Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Addictions, Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. The Assistant Secretary met with DSP staff and also wrote to the Department's Secretary to encourage development of implementation strategies. DSP thought it would be necessary to rekindle interest in the report and the possibility of holding a one day conference was proposed. The conference agenda would be presentations of successful programs of alternative living arrangements, and it was hoped that attention would be focused on the need for a three-tiered coordination policy group recommended in the DI study.

Although the Secretary of DSP was favorable to this idea, he suggested that DSP staff consult with the appropriate State departments to determine if there was support for a DI conference. Thus, a series of meetings were held in early January with Deputy Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries and Division Directors in the Departments of Health and Mental Hygiene, Education, Human Resources, Public Safety and Correctional Services, Budget and Fiscal Planning, the Governor's Office and the Office on Aging. This series of meetings revealed that there still was a high level of commitment to DI and agreement that a State policy task force was needed. Since the Legislature was in session, it was difficult to find a convenient time to hold a conference, and since the purpose of the conference was to obtain agreement to develop a policy group, it was

decided to dispense with the idea of the conference and move towards organizing the policy task force. Although DSP was acting as the lead agency in organizing the task force, its activities were closely coordinated with the Assistant Secretary of Mental Health and Addictions, DHMH, and with the Developmental Disabilities Council.

This proposed task force was never convened. It should be stressed that DSP had obtained high level commitment to this project as evidenced by the letters of acceptance received to the State Planning letter of invitation to participate in the task force. Responses were received from all six Departments and Agencies; membership designations were usually for deputy and assistant secretaries. To further solidify support, DSP Secretary brought this to the attention of the Governor and received his support for the task force.

Why, then, was the DI task force never convened? It came to DSP's attention that the Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Addictions had now decided to form a policy coordinating committee with membership to include State and public representatives. So despite all the support received, DSP made the decision not to convene the task force but rather to let this group take lead responsibility. Mental Health and Addictions represented three key agencies -- Mental Hygiene, Drug Abuse, and Alcoholism Control. Their direct service delivery responsibilities made them a more appropriate agency to take a lead role in this area.

Considerable staff efforts were devoted to this project and there were several positive results. First, general agreement was obtained from six different functional departments that greater interagency coordination was necessary. Secondly, a DI task force on Mental Health Support Systems has been convened and it is interesting to note that several of the action issues proposed by DSP were contained in the Governor's charge to the Mental Health Committee. DSP is also serving as a member of this group.

And finally, as a result of the DI work, DSP became aware that local jurisdictions were in special need of planning assistance. SB 1087 was passed by the 1977 General Assembly and signed into law by the Governor. This bill required the Mental Retardation Administration to determine the need for group homes in every jurisdiction in the State. It was the responsibility of each local subdivision to recommend sites for the identified group homes.

DSP wrote to the Governor in support of SB 1087 and has monitored its implementation. The Department has commented on and suggested revisions for the proposed regulations which implement this bill. Several other possible follow-up activities are being considered, including the development of a model group home zoning ordinance or offering technical assistance to local jurisdictions in developing group home plans.

The study on deinstitutionalization has proven to be a major undertaking of the Human Resources Section. Since this was one of the first issue papers developed for the HSP&CP, succeeding papers have benefited from both its successful and unsuccessful techniques. It is helpful to chart the milestones of this project:

October 1974	Deinstitutionalization Selected as Issue Paper
January 1975	Student Intern Contract
May	DI Planner Hired
June	Executive Plans Analyzed
July	DI Task Force Meeting
July - September	Study Outline Revised and Finalized
September	Agency Interviews, Community Residence Inventory
	Testimony at Legislative Hearing/"Preliminary Draft for Discussion Purposes" Prepared
October - December	Draft Reviewed by Interviewees
January 1976	DI Task Force Meeting
January - March	Draft Report Reviewed by Agencies and Other DSP Divisions
June	Review by Secretary
	Report Published

Several valuable lessons were learned as a result of the preparation and follow-up activities associated with the deinstitutionalization study:

- (1) The feedback regarding this report has been quite favorable and it is being used as a basic information source on deinstitutionalization. It has become a "classic" which agencies refer to in their plans, grant applications, conferences, or for other special studies and task forces. The preparation of the DI report provided one source where all deinstitutionalization activities in the State of Maryland were described, and although each agency had documented their own unique activities in this area, the DI report is still the only document which describes activities of every agency and analyzes their similarities.
- (2) As indicated by the milestones, ten months were devoted to review and revision of the report. Although this review period did delay final publication, the review of the report by other agencies helped DSP gain support for the report's recommendations.
- (3) The report has been extremely useful for DSP internal activities. Information in the report has enabled the staff to knowledgeably comment on legislative bills, to review agency Executive Plans, and also review A-95 applications. Staff are also invited to conferences or workshops on deinstitutionalization as a result of the report's publication and distribution.

Overall, the DI report was one of the most rewarding elements of the HSP&CP. The report was extremely well written and thorough and helped establish DSP credibility with other agencies. The report also demonstrated the value of preparing indepth studies on issues of interagency concern.

COORDINATION IN HUMAN SERVICES

Prior to the initiation of the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project, Human Resources staff of the Department of State Planning conducted interviews with various State agencies. These interviews revealed to the staff the need for coordination between and among agencies in many service areas; for example, services to the elderly population. The agencies themselves expressed an interest in improving the developing coordinative relationships. Thus, even at its inception, the HSP&CP regarded coordination of human services as a primary goal of the project.

The Human Resources staff gained the support of the Human Services Task Force for preparing an issue paper on coordination efforts in the field of human services. The paper was to outline the need for services coordination and review several existing coordinative organizations in an attempt to discover if there were specific techniques that these bodies employed which could help assure success in coordination. There was a general desire to know if there were guidelines for coordination that could be helpful to new or existing coordinating organizations. The preparation of the coordination paper was included in the first year's work program.

In October 1974, a Human Resources staff person was assigned the responsibility for the coordination paper. The project coordinator would provide overall guidance on the paper's content. Until that time, most studies of coordination in human services had been academic in nature; that is, based on well-recognized theories and literature. The coordination paper, while not neglecting the theoretical basis for coordination, was specifically designed to address actual coordination efforts in Maryland, particularly in the area of human services.

The paper originally stressed the need for coordination and the history behind intergovernmental relations at the Federal, state and local levels. The literature review section provided a brief overview of coordination experiences elsewhere and the original case studies explained the organizational structure of five coordinating bodies and how they worked. The paper supplied coordination guidelines for groups interested in coordination as opposed to theoretical conclusions or the future of intergovernmental relations.

A preliminary draft of the paper was sent to HEW during the Summer of 1975 and was received positively. Initially, the Human Resources staff had hoped to have the coordination study completed and released prior to the formation of the Human Services Council. However, in November of 1975, when it became apparent

that the Council would not become a reality, much of the impetus for publishing the study was diminished. The possible formation of the Human Services Council had made the topic of coordination an issue of significance to the Department, but other projects took priority when the Human Services Council was not created.

Work on the coordination paper was not resumed until the Summer of 1976. The original author edited the paper, making some minor updates and corrections. A lengthy version of the paper was circulated in the Department for comments and approval. The revised draft was shared with a few people outside of State Planning and once again received favorable comments. These people regarded the topic of coordination as important and the paper itself of value. Review within the Department was a time consuming effort. The coordination paper was shelved for reasons not directly related to its quality but rather to other pressing Departmental issues.

During the 1977 Legislative Session of the Maryland General Assembly, much attention was given to target groups and the creation of special offices to coordinate services to special populations. With the growing interest in services coordination, the coordination paper was revived. A new staff person was assigned the responsibility of reviewing the draft and making the appropriate revisions to make the coordination paper timely and functional. A new literature search was conducted, resulting in more recent theoretical discussions and descriptions of coordination experience elsewhere. Follow-up interviews were conducted with those agencies originally interviewed for the case studies and the historical discussion of intergovernmental relations was edited to be more relevant to actual coordination processes. The final draft was circulated among the staff for comments and corrections.

Based on the literature review and the case studies contained in the coordination paper, major guidelines for coordination are presented. Acknowledging the need for flexibility in coordinating organizations there are some basic factors which will enhance the coordination process. It is important for all participants (organizations) to understand the goals of the coordination process and exactly what their responsibilities are. Participating organizations should be involved in the design of the potential outputs so that they will have validity and utility for those organizations. The coordinative body ought to be autonomous, that is, not aligned or closely associated with any of its member organizations so that all members feel equal. It is hoped that the above factors in conjunction with the others explained in the coordination paper will be applied to actual coordination activities and increase their effectiveness.

As of this writing, formal, Statewide distribution of the coordination paper has just occurred. But the paper at various stages has been shared with select individuals and groups with positive results. The major findings and summary of the paper were shared with a community education task force and also presented at a Statewide conference on coordination in the Fall of 1977. The findings have also been shared with a graduate school class at the University of Maryland. Final distribution of the paper will include coordinative bodies, the Legislature, State agencies and other commissions and task forces with the responsibility for coordination.

The Maryland Management Development Center is planning a series of seminars for State agencies for the purpose of developing and strengthening coordination techniques. The structure for the seminars will be based on the findings of the paper. Participants will receive a copy of the paper; hopefully, their comments and experiences will lead to additional study of coordination and a refining of coordination techniques.

Also, in terms of future utilization of the Coordination in Human Services paper, it is hoped that organizations reading the paper will want to pursue coordination activities and will request assistance in improving and developing their coordinative relationships. Human Resources staff will be available to provide short term guidance in this area. Follow-up to the coordination paper has been included as a FY 1978 work item.

The development and actual completion of the coordination paper covered a three year period. At this point, there are both assets and liabilities to be recognized from this lengthy process. By the time of the final review and update, one of the organizations used as an original case study had been legislatively abolished and reconstituted. Others had experienced various successes and failures, thus, new lessons in coordination were provided because of the expanded time frame for the project. It is important to realize, however, that these follow-up interviews could have been conducted anyway and been included as part of a second coordination study. Perhaps because coordination was not considered a priority issue by the State there was no urgency to complete the project. Everyone thought of the paper as interesting and helpful but not a necessity.

PURCHASE OF CARE

In the Spring of 1975, the Department distributed a publication entitled Working Paper on Social Services Delivery in Maryland: An Overview of Programs, Problems, and Priorities in the Voluntary Sector. This report was prepared by the Health and Welfare Council on a contractual basis. (For further information regarding this, please see Chapter VII.) The report was circulated to various State agencies for their information. Upon receiving the publication, the Department of Fiscal Services (legislative staff analysts) responded by suggesting that DSP follow-up on the identification and documentation of gaps in service

programs, both public and voluntary, around the State. Fiscal Services was especially interested in the views of voluntary service agencies regarding the levels of reimbursement which they receive from public agencies for purchase of service. It was also suggested that the Department of State Planning and the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning (DBFP) jointly undertake the project.

DSP prepared a preliminary outline of the paper and forwarded it to the Department of Fiscal Services for comment in August 1975. The outline was broader than the specific issue of levels of reimbursement previously suggested by the DFS. Included were issues relevant to purchase of care affecting the mentally ill, mentally retarded, physically handicapped, adult and juvenile offenders, substance abusers, neglected and dependent children, and the aged.

DSP wrote DBFP in September 1975 to apprise them of the development of the purchase of care project. The previous correspondence with the Department of Fiscal Services was enclosed to provide the background for the development of the project. However, DBFP did not indicate any interest in this study, and DSP decided not to conduct the project without their cooperation and assistance.

The need for the purchase of care study was reinforced in May 1976 by the Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate Budget and Taxation Committee. The Chairmen's Letters Section of the Joint Chairmen's Report requested DSP and DBFP to study purchase of care funding, development and operations in Maryland with a written report to the Committees during the Interim Session. The Joint Chairmen's report included specific questions to which the Legislature requested solutions and recommendations for action.

Based on the Joint Chairmen's request, DSP revised its earlier outline and met with staff from the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning to discuss this preliminary outline and to make revisions. Discussions and feedback regarding

the preliminary outline resulted in the Department electing to narrow the focus of the issue paper to purchase of care programs affecting youth offenders and dependent and neglected children.

The Juvenile Services Administration of the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene and the Social Services Administration of the Department of Human Resources were contacted during the project, since both agencies administer purchase of care programs and specific questions in the Chairmen's letters referred to these agencies. The project was perceived by JSA and SSA as necessary and desirable. Various providers from whom the State purchases care were also contacted and also viewed the project as necessary. All involved were eager to contribute to the research efforts as all were potential beneficiaries.

The development of an issue paper on purchase of care was consistent with two goals of the HSP&CP. As required in DSP's legislative mandate, the Department provides information and assistance to the General Assembly and any of its committees. Secondly, assuming coordination to be a primary goal of the project, purchase of care was an area where enhanced coordination was imperative. JSA and SSA were administering purchase of care programs differently and reimbursing for identical services at different levels, sometimes to identical clients. Given scarce resources, enhanced coordination presumably would result in more efficient use of existing dollars. Recommendations offered in the paper related to coordinating the administration of the two purchase of care programs. Further, studying the role of private group home operators in providing purchase of care services was consistent with the HSP&CP goal of coordination with the voluntary sector.

Interviewing was the primary methodology utilized to research the purchase of care issue. Relevant agency personnel were interviewed and a sample of service providers were also interviewed. A standard interview schedule was

utilized for all providers so as to insure consistency of information procured from the variety of facilities chosen. The interviewing technique was chosen during the developmental stages of the project and was employed until all data were collected. Facilities were selected for interviewing based upon level of service rendered, geographic location, affiliation or non-affiliation with religious groups. An attempt was made to interview at least one facility of each type in each geographic locality.

As stated above, the project was jointly conducted by DSP and the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning. Two staff members from each agency participated in the project. The project manager from DSP had been involved with the topic since the initial correspondence from the Department of Fiscal Services on the Working Paper on Social Services Delivery in Maryland: Overview of Programs, Problems and Priorities in the Voluntary Sector. The second DSP staff member became involved in the project because of specific expertise in purchase of care as a result of previous employment with the Juvenile Services Administration. This combination of experience was an asset to the project effort.

The DBFP staff were members of Management Analysis Section of that Department. Their expertise was primarily in the area of fiscal management, whereas DSP staff were better versed in programmatic issues. The combination of both areas of talent enhanced the comprehensive nature of the issues addressed in the paper.

The DBFP staff desired a strong fiscal orientation, while the DSP staff preferred greater emphasis on issues related to programs with an interface of fiscal and programmatic issues. This difference resulted in many drafts of the paper reflecting serious compromises for both Departments. DSP's first draft was completed in December 1976. DBFP wrote a counter draft in January 1977. Consensus on the final product was not achieved until both Departments jointly

wrote the paper. Utilizing this tactic still did not result in a jointly acceptable product until March. DBFP did not want to address issues tangential to the specific questions posed in the Chairmen's letters, particularly issues relating to deficiencies in purchase of care programs which, if improved, would impact the budget. DSP, on the other hand, felt a responsibility to recognize the existence of deficiencies and recommend means for ameliorating them. The final product did specifically address the questions with tangential consideration given only to those topics which DBFP considered to have no fiscal impact. The preparation of a joint report prepared by two Executive Staff agencies did delay distribution of the report, but because these two agencies were involved, the issue paper received greater credibility. Agencies recognized that the paper's recommendations were endorsed by both the State Planning and the State Budget Departments.

The completed issue paper was distributed to the legislative budget committees and several State agencies. The specific questions posed by the Chairmen's letters were addressed. Summarily, the Chairmen wanted to know how much the State should pay for children placed in group homes and institutions. The paper delineated a cost model which had been jointly prepared by SSA and JSA, and recommended that the model be evaluated regularly to determine its appropriateness. Additionally, the Chairmen's letters inquired if the Department of Education should be expected to pay all or a portion of the educational costs for institutions with on-campus educational facilities. The issue paper concluded that local education agencies are reluctant to accept responsibility for providing special education services for a variety of reasons. However, the primary recommendation offered was to develop an interagency coordination mechanism to guarantee that all children requiring special education and other ancillary services receive them.

Interagency coordination and other recommendations in the paper were of particular interest to the State Department of Education, the Social Services Administration and the Juvenile Services Administration. The research indicated a need to increase coordination among these agencies. All of the service providers who were interviewed received a copy of the paper, as well as any other provider who requested it. The Governor's Commission on the Funding of Education for Handicapped Children (Schifter Commission) also requested copies of the paper because of their interest in providing a free appropriate education to all children with handicapping conditions. Children served by SSA and JSA at the time of the research were not receiving education services from the Department of Education, and, therefore, were not receiving appropriate education programs. Copies of the paper were also requested by the Mental Health Law Project.

SSA and JSA were encouraged by the findings of the report. Implementation of the major recommendations would result in enhanced education services to the children under their jurisdiction. The Schifter Commission has included in their report to the Governor and General Assembly the major recommendation of the purchase of care paper which reflects a positive reaction by the Department of Education as well.

Additionally, this project provided DSP with an increased awareness of the need for various State agencies to communicate with each other to avoid duplicating services. The problems caused by the lack of coordination which surfaced as a result of the project were significant. Many more people and agencies are now aware of these problems and coalesce on an ongoing basis to avoid the coordination inadequacies discovered as a result of this research.

ORGANIZATIONAL APPROACHES TO SERVE THE NEEDS OF SPECIAL TARGET GROUPS

During the past decade, the State of Maryland, like many of its sister states, has been concerned about the effective organization of its government. In Maryland, the response has been to establish 12 cabinet level departments and to organize the planning and delivery of human services around functions, i.e., broad areas of social concern such as health, education, public safety and corrections, and human resources. During the three years of the Project, numerous legislative proposals have been introduced to create special purpose offices which would have the effect of fragmenting the existing functionally organized departments.

Each year, advocates of target group agencies argue before the Legislature that functional agencies are not responsive to the needs of special population groups and, therefore, new specialized agencies are needed. On the other hand, some officials have expressed concern that fractionalizing the human service planning and delivery system along client lines complicates efforts to meet Statewide social needs. The Governor had appointed a special task force to "Review the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of State Government." State Planning's interest and concerns were first expressed when the Departmental Secretary proposed the formation of a Human Services Council (for further information, see Chapter III) to address the problems and needs of special populations which crossed functional organizational lines.

There had been limited opportunity to study the new organization approaches which had been proposed and to evaluate the relative potential of these to meet the needs of special target groups. Because of the need for greater examination of this subject, the Department of State Planning decided to undertake the target group study.

Preliminary research for the paper began in late Spring 1976, and based on this, the target group paper was included in the third year work program. With

the beginning of the new fiscal year (July 1976), full time attention was devoted by DSP staff to this activity. The first step was to prepare a study design. Phase one of the study design was to survey experiences in other states and to contact Federal agencies. This research indicated that: (1) little information exists on the comparative effectiveness of services delivery by functional or target group agencies; (2) any relevant information on the broader issue of services integration and government reorganization is not conclusive; and (3) the issue is basically a political one. Based on these findings, it was necessary to change the original emphasis from effectiveness/efficiency issues to a concentration on how advocacy can be directed towards improvement within the system. Thus, the study outline was revised with the following major elements: (1) the impetus for Government reorganization; (2) the nature and functions of interest groups; and (3) an evaluation of target group agencies.

An extensive report was prepared on these three topics by September. Since Maryland had selected the functional approach, some alternatives for improving sensitivity to the needs of special populations within the existing State organizational framework were needed. One idea was to create a system of human service representatives (ombudsmen) for appropriate State departments. Another six weeks were devoted to additional research and developing the mechanics of creating such a system.

In mid-November, a draft copy was circulated to the Human Resources staff for review and comment. A short period of corrections followed and the paper was then ready for review by the Division Director.

The project manager for this study left DSP at the end of the year the paper was dormant for several months. The number of legislative proposals to create special offices had increased in the 1977 session of the General

Assembly and the findings and research of the target group paper were needed. Two major concerns about the paper were raised by the Division Director. First, the study was over 50 pages in length, and DSP had learned that long reports tend to become "bookshelf" documents. Secondly, the study recommended creating human service representatives, requiring additional personnel costs, and it was felt that this would be unacceptable.

In order to distribute the study before the end of the Legislative Session, it was decided to prepare an abstract of the paper and replace the final chapter on human service representatives with suggestions on how existing State agencies could increase their sensitivity to the needs of special populations. On March 31, 1977, the Governor received this abbreviated report entitled "Organizational Approaches to Serve the Needs of Special Target Groups."

A favorable response was received from the Governor's Office regarding the study. The paper was referred to the Governor's Task Force to Review Reorganization of the Executive Branch of State Government for use as a background document. Based on this favorable response, the study was also distributed to all human service agencies and key legislators.

Several legislators who supported bills to create special offices for veterans and the handicapped wrote in opposition to the target group issue paper. However, the majority of responses were quite favorable. In fact, the Governor's Commission on Children and Youth requested 50 copies of the report to distribute to its planning workshop/conference.

The Office for Coordination of Services to the Handicapped and Office for Veterans bills were passed by both the House and Senate and were signed into law due to intense political pressure applied by their advocates.

A final and more important benefit was DSP's early recognition of an issue of interagency concern. This study was not requested by any specific group or

agency or by the Human Services Task Force. Rather, it was identified through DSP staff awareness of interagency concerns which were potentially conflicting and duplicative. This was one of the goals of the HSP&CP.

TRANSPORTATION DISADVANTAGED

During the course of the development of the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project, the Human Resources staff observed that many of the complex problems and issues found in the social services sector could be attributed to impacts created by elements in the physical sector. Transportation, it was found, played an integral role in linking program resources with clients and was a key in many instances to an individual's overall well-being.

These two considerations - the interrelationships with the delivery of human services and the broader impact upon an individual's well-being - made the study of the transportation disadvantaged of prime interest. Because of these reasons, the Transportation section was assigned primary responsibility to prepare the report.

Staff proceeded to establish resource contacts with areawide and local studies focusing on specialized transportation needs; human service delivery problems were identified and communication channels established. Study staff compiled primary data from attitude and travel behavior surveys of the transportation disadvantaged undertaken by Baltimore City, the Health and Welfare Council and from research studies done elsewhere in the United States. Census and demographic data were supplemented and service inventories and directories were collected. Comprehensive transportation planning documents were examined to provide insights as to transportation trends. The scope of the report was narrowed to the study of the mobility problems of the disadvantaged with emphasis placed more upon these groups than on transportation trends in general.

To this end, it was decided that the document would be a planning resource. It would be the first comprehensive assessment of the mobility situation of the disadvantaged in Maryland. It would consolidate information (legislation, funding sources, operating programs, vehicle resources, etc.), outline issues (labor, funding, institutional responsibilities, coordination, technology) and suggest alternatives (coordination, service delivery and management models, vehicle types, successful program innovations, etc.) which influenced the mobility of the transportation disadvantaged.

Information collected was restructured for clarity and to provide a sense of direction to the report. Staff first identified the transportation disadvantaged and their mobility problems through a review of the literature and technical documents. The magnitude and location of these disadvantaged groups in the State were then determined by way of census data, incidence factors developed at the national level and other available special studies undertaken by local governments or other State agencies. Funding sources, operating programs, ongoing needs studies and transportation resources were inventoried. An investigation of innovative transportation service provisions underway across the United States was carried out in order to draw observations on the potential success of their application to areas in Maryland. This was accomplished through literature review, national conference attendance and information exchange with other States. Needed actions, including the establishment of firm Statewide policies dealing with the needs of transportation disadvantaged, were discussed in the report.

The remainder of the study period (approximately 10 months) was devoted to completing these elements of the report. During the same period, the Department became actively involved in a great many aspects of specialized transportation. DSP coordinated its study efforts with those of other State, regional and local agencies. DSP participated in an elderly-handicapped conference called by

members of the Governor's Interagency Committee on Specialized Transportation to discuss issues of coordination and the logistics of planning with local groups. The Department prepared and evaluated a survey on coordination by human service and transportation providers which identified existing arrangements, problems, prospects and attitudes. DSP also participated in a Federal Regional Council workshop which served as a sounding board for local jurisdictions and disadvantaged groups to express their concerns about Federal rural transportation and human service program problems. The Department also became actively involved in providing technical assistance on the Project Management Committee of the Baltimore Region Elderly and Handicapped Study and participated in the review of the Washington area counterpart. These efforts were designed to produce implementable plans for the transportation of elderly and handicapped individuals. All of these efforts served to improve the study efforts of the disadvantaged report. In turn, study research uncovered information of great significance to the various specialized transportation activities in which the Department was involved.

From early Spring through Summer, the report underwent several internal and external reviews and updates. In March 1977, the preliminary draft was completed and circulated for internal staff review. Six weeks later a revision was circulated for review to members of the Governor's Interagency Committee on Specialized Transportation and officials of the Maryland Department of Transportation. During the early Summer, appropriate revisions were made to the report and a final copy for printing was readied. A mailing list of nearly four hundred persons comprising local transportation and social planners, human services program administrators, legislators, State agency planners and officials, special interest groups and concerned citizens was prepared. The report was then entered in a contract bidding process for printing and was distributed in November 1977.

Since the report has only recently been released, it would be premature to attempt to assess its overall impact or accomplishments. Complimentary letters from the Governor and the Secretary of the Department of Transportation have already been received. These letters commended the Department for the comprehensive nature of the report and its usefulness for specialized transportation planning. Much of the effort that has gone into its preparation has served to inform and influence planners and officials involved in many of the other specialized transportation studies underway. Thus far:

- (1) Vehicle and operating program inventories compiled by DSP were utilized in the Baltimore Regional Elderly and Handicapped Study;
- (2) A DSP inventory of private carrier operations in the State will be utilized in one county's public transportation study; and
- (3) A copy of the report obtained by a DSP planner working in a rural county of the State has prompted him to refocus his thinking and strategies to overcome a "shelved" specialized transportation study recently completed by a consultant.

Persons in the field (human service providers and affected groups) were calling for less study and more action to meet the needs of the transportation disadvantaged. It was best to establish an information base (from available data) and a framework for discussion (outlining issues and prospects) as a prerequisite for State action. Hopefully, the report will establish the needed environment for development of sound analytical procedures and the establishment of firm policies Statewide.

EDUCATION-TO-WORK LINKAGES

One responsibility associated with the ongoing Human Services Planning and Coordination Project (HSP&CP) has been the preparation of a series of condition, trend and issue papers relevant to human resource development in Maryland. The education-to-work linkages project is indicative of the Department's interest in addressing the pervasive and long term condition of structural unemployment through the effective utilization of education and manpower training programs.

Impetus for the education-to-work linkages project was the result of staff participation in the activities of the State Economic Study Committee in the Summer of 1975. The Committee was interested in addressing the issue of alleviating unemployment and improving overall economic conditions in Maryland. As a result of this participation, the Department of State Planning was asked to submit to the Committee suggestions for alleviating and improving economic conditions in Maryland. One of the Departmental suggestions was to improve the utilization of education and manpower training programs as weapons against existing and future unemployment conditions.

Having made the suggestion to the Committee that some attention should be devoted to improving the effectiveness with which education and manpower training programs are utilized as resources for combatting existing and potential structural unemployment problems in the State and its subdivisions, the manpower planner of the staff proceeded to conduct some preliminary research to develop an outline of relevant issues and topics, attempting to focus upon service delivery needs and problems and their subsequent effect upon the various segments of the State's population. This initial draft outline was shared with several education and manpower experts for review and comments on an informal basis. The outline was then further refined to reflect some of the issues and concerns expressed by these individuals.

It should be noted at this point that the education-to-work project was first conceived as a paper to focus upon manpower training and vocational education in Maryland. However, as research into the issue progressed, it became obvious that the topic was too narrow in scope and that some of the problems which emerged went beyond the realm of vocational education alone and included a broad spectrum of concerns in the total education and manpower systems.

The project originally was to be developed as a research effort involving an extensive literature search of prevailing conditions and trends in Maryland which effect the utilization of the manpower training and education systems. At the same time, alternatives or strategies for improving the effectiveness of these systems to help facilitate a better match between the skill levels of the population with the labor market requirements of business and industry was to be compiled. The second phase of the project was to involve sharing these initial findings and recommendations with more than fifty experts in the areas of employment and education to solicit their opinions, support and comments for the development of a comprehensive education-to-work linkages system in Maryland.

The results of the interviews were to be consolidated and compiled for inclusion in a final Departmental paper discussing employment and economic conditions and trends and viable alternative strategies for improving the coordination and effective utilization of education and manpower training resources in Maryland.

It was decided that a draft of the paper would be completed in its entirety and circulated among the aforementioned experts for review. Their comments would then be incorporated in a final paper of education-to-work linkages in Maryland.

It is expected that the first draft of the paper will provide the forum for the continuation of dialogue among the experts mentioned above in an attempt to assess the existing linkages between education and work, and develop strategies relevant to the development and maintenance of a comprehensive system sensitive to present and future employment and training needs of all segments of the State's population.

The final paper will include the recommendations concerned experts and State Planning staff agree are feasible for implementation in Maryland. It is anticipated that the paper will be distributed among legislators and other policy makers in both the academic and manpower/employment communities.

VII. ANALYSIS OF NEEDS AND CONDITIONS

One way to assist human service agencies to develop planning capabilities is the development of a comprehensive data base. The activities described in this section - social indicators, program inventory, and the role of the voluntary sector - comprised DSP efforts to develop a human services planning data base. All three work items initiated from the original HEW application and first year work program. In fact, the ideas for social indicators and program inventory predate the Project and were discussed in the Study Design for a Human Resources Plan.

The purpose of analysis of needs and conditions was to combine needs assessment information (or demand) with an inventory of existing services (supply) in order to provide the data base for planning a more responsive service delivery system. The Social Indicator Report was the initial effort toward achieving the demand assessment and the program inventory was the next step toward the creation of a much needed comprehensive data base to facilitate effective and efficient human services planning in Maryland. Since social indicators and program inventory analyses concentrated on State services, it was necessary to add an analysis of the role of the voluntary sector in service provision to augment the data base.

SOCIAL INDICATORS

In 1969, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) published Towards a Social Report. This publication was one of the first comprehensive efforts at the national level on development of social indicators to measure the quality of life in the United States. Based on the concepts described in the HEW report, DSP began considering the possibility of developing social indicators at the State and local levels.

The subject of social indicators has long been discussed in periodicals, journals and academic reviews as a means to measure social status in the way

that economic indicators have been used to gauge the state of the economy. It was hoped that social indicators would be able to gauge the social status of the nation; however, a review of the literature revealed that most systems for developing social indicators were theoretical in nature and had not been practically applied. This led to the conclusion that Maryland should develop its own pragmatic approach. DSP was interested in operationalizing the theoretical approaches and academic concepts in order to develop a practical and innovative system for measuring social change at the State and local levels.

As part of a contract to help the Department prepare a Human Resources Plan Study Design, a private consulting firm defined a social indicator as follows:

- A social indicator is an index whose subject matter is broader than the discipline of economics;
- An indicator is an index sensitive to change within the social system, which may be used as a variable to predict or represent changes (i.e., a predictive indicator);
- An indicator is an index which provides a quantitative assessment system. Comparison of an indicator to a standard or goal permits assessment of the performance of the social system toward achievement of objectives or standards.¹

The consultant recommended an approach utilizing three kinds of indicators: input, coverage and output. They also recommended that the activity sector/target population framework be the format for indicator construction. Thus, indicators would be developed for each of the nine functional activity sectors. Development of social indicators was also to be updated on a periodic basis. DSP did not agree with the concepts of input, coverage and output indicators, but did adopt the idea of using the activity sector format. The accompanying work agenda suggested by these consultants indicated that the Department of State Planning would need special expertise in data systems management and processing techniques.

¹The Research Group, A Proposed System for State of Maryland Human Services Planning, Volume II, Technical Appendices, p. 27.

The receipt of Partnership monies provided State Planning with the additional resources necessary to develop social indicators. A private consulting firm was retained in the Spring of 1975, based on their experience in developing social indicators. The consultants were responsible for determining information needs by activity sector; completing a data inventory; postulating a series of social statistics and candidate set of indicators, and testing them for relevancy, reliability and significance; summarizing the results; preparing an interim report; constructing the indicators; interpreting the results; preparing a users manual; and preparing the final report.

Although the burden of responsibility for preparation rested with the consultants, DSP staff were essentially partners in this endeavor. Staff thoroughly reviewed and edited all drafts, assisted in data collection, recommended indicator formats, verified the results of indicator construction, and analyzed and interrupted the indicators.

Considerable efforts were made to involve human service agencies, planners, data managers and other interested persons in the social indicator project. Several Human Services Task Force meetings were held to discuss social indicators. Interviews were scheduled with key representatives in all human service agencies to explain the project and to enlist their aid in identifying and collecting data. A special ad hoc task force of providers and users of data was also appointed to help advise the Department and monitor the project's progress.

The Interim Report was completed in June 1975 and was widely distributed in order to obtain suggestions for revisions to be made in the final report. The Interim Report indicated that progress had been made in the following areas:

- A conceptual framework for a social indicator system had been designed;
- A data inventory had been completed;
- Social statistics for inclusion in the social indicator report had been identified and defined;
- Social indicators procedures and selection criteria had been developed; and
- Social indicators had been proposed for analysis.

A draft copy of the final report was also prepared for DSP review. This document was extensively revised by staff. Revisions requested ranged from editorial and grammatical errors to requests to rerun computer programs and requests to generate additional indicators. These extensive revisions caused a considerable delay in the publication of the final report. DSP staff review took approximately four weeks to complete and during this time the consultant's staff had been assigned to other contracts. Thus, a further delay occurred until the consultant could restaff.

One area of significant disagreement between DSP staff and the consulting firm was the use of the indicators for interpretative purposes. The consultants refused to include possible cause and effect relationships suggested by the indicators. Staff were concerned that practical interpretation of the indicators was necessary in order to demonstrate how the indicators could be used by program managers and planners. DSP staff prepared a case study on the health status of Maryland's Eastern Shore to demonstrate how special analyses could be conducted for planning purposes. This was included as an appendix to the report.

The final document, Social Indicator Report: A Conceptual Approach, was published in April 1976. The report presented an initial system for depicting the socio-economic status of the population over time. Social indicators were not designed for program evaluation nor were they developed to show cause and effect relationships. Rather, the indicators constructed were intended to be:

a single measure usually expressed as an indicator value composed of two or more social statistics which logically and statistically depict the status of the population with respect to a specific area of social concern. For example, a single value between 0-100 derived from measures of education, occupation, and income would depict the socio-economic status of the population.¹

The following social indicators were constructed: socioeconomic status, health status, public safety, employment, income sufficiency/affluence, education and social economic status, housing availability and cost, housing quality, family structure and well-being of children. Indicators values were shown for each county in Maryland for the years 1970 and 1973. The raw scores for the indicator values were scaled between 0 and 100 for comparative purposes.

The users manual was distributed in November 1976. This publication, entitled Technical Documentation and Assessment for Social Indicator Report for Maryland, April 1976, was prepared as a supplement to describe the methodology employed in the report and to provide more detail about the mechanics of the indicator construction. The manual was not widely distributed since it was of a technical nature and was intended for data managers.

Evaluation

Included in the transmittal letter was a request that the readers assist in evaluating the social indicators report. Five questions were asked:

- (1) Are there any current plans for producing new data that would strengthen the social indicators?
- (2) In areas where availability has been a problem, is it worth the effort needed to develop new data sources?
- (3) In what ways are the social indicators useful to you and others?
- (4) What further research could be conducted to enhance the value of one or more of the indicators?
- (5) Do the indicators in your field seem reasonable? What postulated explanation can be given for the outcomes?

¹ Social Indicator Report, p.3.

This was followed up with a special request for written responses from readers. A total of 26 responses was received from a wide variety of human service agencies representing both State and local governments, voluntary health and welfare agencies, academic institutions, and other states involved in developing social indicators. Based on these comments, a special meeting was convened in late Fall of 1976 to discuss whether or not social indicators should be updated. Nineteen people, again representing a variety of agencies, attended this session.

The evaluation and review responses clustered around four major areas: data considerations and inadequacies, social indicator utility, suggestions for future improvements, and methodological considerations.

All reviewers agreed that data inadequacies were the major stumbling blocks to the development of more useful indicators. Many indicators which had been postulated could not be constructed due to data unavailability. Often the indicators which were developed were incomplete since key variables were not included because: (1) the appropriate statistics were not available for both 1970 and 1973, (2) the data was not available by county unit, or (3) sometimes statistics were only available for metropolitan areas.

Another criticism was that the base years chosen, 1970 and 1973, were too "old" for planning purposes. A large number of indicators utilized information from the Annual Vital Statistics reports and 1973 was the most current report available. Several suggestions were made to help DSP use more current data, e.g., estimate social statistics, develop precursive indicators using trend line extrapolation, or push forward 1970 census information. However, these suggestions were not feasible or would diminish the reliability of the indicators constructed.

Before beginning the indicator project, two possible uses had been postulated: to aid in policy setting and to aid in management decisions in Executive

Plans. To a limited extent, social indicators were used in the preparation of Executive Plans. In reviewing these Plans, DSP noted that social indicator data was included in the Conditions and Trends chapters of some Plans. However, the indicators were not used to aid in management decision-making, as originally intended. Overall, the social indicator report had been of limited usefulness. In most cases, the indicators were not specific enough for the planning and programming requirements of the participants. Nevertheless, some agencies found the indicators useful in obtaining a general overview of the relationship between various functional areas encompassed within the indicators in different jurisdictions. Other agencies used the raw data and social statistics included in the report but did not use the indicators themselves.

It was originally thought that social indicators would be updated periodically. After several such indicator reports had been generated, a data base would be established with the capability to measure changes in social status over time and depict socio-economic trends. Since DSP intended to replicate the social indicator process, the Department was particularly interested in readers' suggestions on how to improve the report.

A considerable amount of data was collected but not used because it was not available for every subdivision within the State. For such areas as housing, environmental health, and economic development, data were available for urban areas only. Therefore, it was suggested that State Planning drop the requirement for county by county coverage. However, this would compromise Statewide comparability of data.

Several other suggestions for improvement were submitted to State Planning. Urban planners recommended that sub-county indicators be developed since indicators which reflected county-wide status were too gross a level to be useful for planning purposes. DSP encountered numerous difficulties in collecting data at

the county level and believed that even more problems would be encountered in trying to collect sub-county data. Further, it was felt that this was a more appropriate function for local planners.

Sequential updates of selected activity sectors was also suggested. This would make the scope of the project much more manageable, fewer staff resources would be required, and there would be an opportunity to pilot test new methodologies on a small scale. The drawback of sequential updating is that the report would lose its comprehensive focus and capability of cross-functional comparisons.

A final suggestion was to develop subjective indicators to complement the objective status indicators already generated. This would involve surveying people as to their feeling about the quality of life and attempt to probe such subjects as satisfaction, self-esteem, alienation, sense of accomplishment, etc. While these subjective measurements would be interesting, DSP's research indicated that there is not necessarily a correlation between objective and subjective indicators.

Another major area of concern to reviewers was the methodology employed to construct the indicators. Some of their reasons challenging the use of factor analysis were:

- The sample size was too small;
- Other techniques available were simpler and possibly more appropriate;
- Factor analysis may have been incorrectly applied;
- The same factor loadings were used for 1970 and 1973.

Other methodological concerns questioned the scaling approach used and the advisability of comparing counties on specific statistics. Based on this feedback and the experience of the staff of the Human Resources Section in preparing social indicators, DSP has concluded that it is not feasible to update social indicators. The major reason for not repeating this effort was the lack of com-

mitment by user agencies. Although most agencies found social indicators to be interesting in a general sense, the indicators were not found to be helpful in providing information for specific projects. In other words, planners have found the indicators to be of limited utility, since they were not specific enough for planning and programming purposes on a project by project basis. It should be noted that this was not the purpose of social indicators.

Also, a lack of commitment was evident in the fact that user agencies were not able to endorse the data. That is, there was not agreement that the social statistics used to construct the indicators were valid. Solution of this problem is difficult, since considerable efforts were made to gain input from other State agencies prior to generating the indicators.

DSP also found that the indicators were not being used for cross-functional comparisons or analyses. It was hoped that in addition to providing indicators on specific areas of social concern, e.g., health, education, the indicators would also be used to aid planners in understanding broad societal trends, but there does not appear to be an interest in this type of cross-functional information.

A follow-up activity, though, has resulted from the social indicator project. As previously discussed, data collection was a major stumbling block. Agencies have frequently used the social statistics (although not the social indicators) in their planning and research activities, and some agencies have requested that DSP publish a statistical abstract. Since another State agency already publishes this type of report, it was not necessary for DSP to act on this recommendation. Instead of a statistical abstract, DSP decided to prepare a data directory. This project has been included in the FY 78 work program. The data directory will be a listing of all data sources and data systems which are utilized by State agencies. It will provide information about the types of data

produced by State agencies, the regularity of publication, and a contact point from which the publication can be obtained.

DSP was not successful in solving all the data collection and methodological problems in constructing social indicators. However, the Department was successful in operationalizing the concept of social indicators. State Planning is unique in that it was actually able to generate indicators at the State and local levels and was able to apply what had largely been a theoretical and academic concept. As pointed out in Putting Social Indicators to Work, An Annotated Bibliography published by the Office of Planning and Research of California (April 1977), "This report represents one of the few state efforts at selecting key indicators rather than simply assembling available socioeconomic data." The development of social indicators is still a popular item as evidenced by the many topic listings in Project SHARE. Many of the lessons learned through the DSP experience should be helpful to other states considering development of social indicators.

State Planning was somewhat disappointed in that many of the review comments dealt with problems previously explained in the Interim Report or in Human Services Task Force meetings. Several critical decisions were required before the indicators were generated, e.g., data units, base years, data availability, and these decisions were thoroughly discussed in both the Interim Report and at advisory group meetings. Considerable efforts were made to gain user input into these decisions during the interim stage. However, numerous criticisms of these decisions were received in the final report evaluation. Perhaps one way of overcoming this would be to develop a training package on the uses and limitations of the indicators. DSP widely distributed the report and assumed that the explanations in the report and the User's Manual would be sufficient. It is now suggested that training assistance be offered in the cover letter of future major work products.

PROGRAM INVENTORY

The history of the Department's program inventory project dates back to the August 1972 report, Preliminary Study Design for the Human Resources Element of the Maryland State Development Plan. The inventory was seen as the first element of the Human Resources Plan and also one aspect of the analysis of conditions and trends in the human services field. It included surveying the plans, policies and programs of the agencies that affect the social conditions of the population in Maryland. This project was designed to provide an important component of a comprehensive human services data base and serve as an input into setting policy directions in the human services area.

During the succeeding year, the preliminary study design was expanded and refined as comments were solicited and received from State, regional and local agencies as well as HEW. In August 1973, the revised Human Resources Plan Study Design was published, retaining the program inventory concept virtually intact. A work program was developed to prepare the inventory which identified the data to be obtained in surveying the human service agencies.

Following the publication of the Study Design, DSP staff developed a detailed questionnaire with which to obtain data on human services plans, policies and programs among State agencies. More than 50 interviews were conducted with personnel in State human service agencies to obtain information for the program inventory as well as other human service planning activities. A substantial amount of information was obtained about human service issues and problems which proved invaluable in directing the future course of the HSP&CP.

An inventory of programs was prepared in accordance with the Activity Sector/Target Population (AS/TP) framework. The activity sector framework provided a guiding structure for classifying the information that was collected about the State's service delivery system. The AS/TP approach was expected to

provide a comprehensive system for organizing and analyzing State human service programs by functional area, cutting across departmental lines and providing a basis for identifying opportunities for improved coordination among programs and agencies in particular functional areas. A second dimension was added by the target population concept. The general population was divided into various groups based on different stages of the life cycle (from children to the aged) and special vulnerabilities (economically disadvantaged, disabled/handicapped, and minorities).

The initial inventory was prepared from data compiled from agency interviews, plan reviews, budget reports and other sources during the second half of 1974. DSP staff conducted the interviews and data gathering and the HSP&CP Coordinator tabulated and compiled the information. Numerous methodological difficulties were discovered in trying to develop a complete and comprehensive human service data base from these sources:

In attempting to complete the program inventory form, it was learned that it was not possible to obtain full information on many of the topics listed. Meaningful budget information was especially difficult to locate. Not all agencies breakdown their budgets by programs; in some cases, entire divisions show up as one budget item although they operate numerous programs. Information on the characteristics of the client population is quite limited. Published sources do not identify related programs and rarely mention program evaluation or its results.¹

In some agencies, very detailed and comprehensive data were obtained from the program inventory questionnaires on program operations, client caseloads, resources available, and the like. In others, very little information could be obtained. An attempt was made to use secondary sources (agencies' plans, budgets, annual reports, etc.) to supplement the agency interviews, with indifferent success. There were too many gaps and/or inconsistencies in the data to publish

¹"Present Status" Report, 1974, p.14.

the full inventory, although analysis of the results revealed the dimensions of human service planning and coordination activities in the State.

During the Winter of 1975, DSP staff began to update the inventory of programs using a less ambitious survey form. Information on the number of clients served by each program and the demographic characteristics of the clients were not collected in this effort. Minorities were deleted as one of the target groups since no programs were designed to serve only this group. Again, problems were encountered in compiling the inventory.

Although the general rationale for the project had been articulated, detailed guidelines concerning the scope of the effort and the preparation of the inventory were lacking. Each staff person used his/her own judgement concerning what programs to include under the "human service" umbrella in the agency interviews, and there was significant variation in the scope of the programs reported on the survey form. It was decided to devote additional efforts to resolving these difficulties with the constraint that no further field work would be conducted.

Two staff members were then assigned to be project managers to assure that the project would be completed. To maintain as much consistency as possible, rules for classifying programs by activity sector and target population were developed. Programs that provided services in more than one functional area were shown in each appropriate subsector, but in order to avoid double counting the budget data, budget figures were to be shown only once under the primary activity sector. It was not possible to analyze the distribution of resources by target group for the age specific target groups (with minor exceptions). However, programs primarily serving the economically disadvantaged and disabled/handicapped were analyzed separately on the rationale that these programs were designed specifically to serve these target groups rather than being more general

programs serving the entire population. Administrative programs designed to support direct program delivery were classified under the "Support" or "Other" subsector.

These changes were incorporated in the revised program inventory during April and May of 1976 and a substantial analysis of coordination linkages and mechanisms was added in June. Following an internal review period during the July-October period, the report was prepared for publication and distribution in December 1976.

The report was distributed to a wide variety of officials in State, regional, and local agencies in Maryland. Approximately 300 copies of the report were sent to representatives in each of the Cabinet agencies, the Executive Branch, the General Assembly, county planning and human services agencies, and institutions of higher education in Maryland. In addition, a number of requests for the report were received from other states, and copies were sent when requested.

At present, the Human Resources staff are in the process of determining whether the Inventory of State Administered Human Services Programs should be updated. A detailed and thorough internal evaluation of the report concluded that the report is potentially of significant value to State and local human service providers and planners. This internal evaluation also indicated that greater attention must be concentrated on resolving program classification problems in future updates. For example, it was noted that there was considerable variation in the scope and detail of the data available. The definition of "program" differed from agency to agency, and it was difficult to classify programs in terms of target groups. The lack of a single source for detailed budget data continued to prove troublesome. The Maryland State Budget provided the most authoritative source of information, but many "projects" providing different functional services were subsumed under one program category in the

budget report. The Executive Plans of the agencies provided more detailed expenditure data, but these expenditures reflected agency funding requests rather than the approved budgets, and were, therefore, somewhat inflated. Many programs were shown in more than one place in the inventory (for example, vocational education programs were presented in both the "Expanding Employment Opportunities" and "Development of Vocational/Technical Skills") because the services they provided were appropriate in both cases. This approach was felt to be valid in analysis of the program count, but led to double counting of program expenditures. Also, it was impossible to analyze the distribution of resources by target group, as most programs served more than one group. It is important these problems be addressed in a consistent fashion if program inventory is updated.

Of course, the decision whether or not the report will be updated depends on the collective response of the provider community concerning the report's utility. The staff is in the process of interviewing a representative sample of approximately 25 planners, administrators and program evaluation specialists in the State human service agencies to determine whether the report has been used and if so, in what ways. If their response is positive, DSP will solicit their cooperation in compiling an updated inventory. Only with the active participation and cooperation of the provider community can the problems identified in preparing a comprehensive human services inventory be satisfactorily resolved.

Another possible improvement has been suggested if program inventory is updated. As was the case with social indicators, the potential uses of the program inventory were not always clearly understood by human service provider agencies. Training sessions conducted by DSP staff would probably increase the utility of the report.

VOLUNTARY SECTOR

It has long been recognized that voluntary agencies play a major role in meeting the human service needs of Maryland residents; however, precisely what services they provided was not as clearly known. In order to assess the adequacy of State delivered services, it was necessary to know what services were being provided by the voluntary sector. The Department wanted to learn whether voluntary services complemented or duplicated the services available in the public sector and whether groups who may not be served by public agencies are reached by voluntary agencies.

In March of 1974, there was an agreement between staff members of the Department of State Planning (DSP) and the Health and Welfare Council (HWC) that certain elements of DSP's Human Resources Plan Study Design and HWC's General Work Plan for a Needs and Services Analysis Program coincided. To avoid the duplication of similar efforts, it was decided that the Health and Welfare Council would expand its efforts to accommodate the Department's needs. HWC would receive a small grant from DSP to accomplish this task.

As the March 1974 date indicates, the project preceded the initiation of the HEW Partnership Grant and was funded through a HUD "701" Comprehensive Planning Grant. However, since the project extended through FY 1974, the cost of DSP staff monitoring and administration of this contract was supported by HEW funds. This was consistent with the first year work program task to review all consultant's work performed prior to the Partnership Grant.

The scope of services contract stipulated that the Health and Welfare Council prepare for the Department: (1) a computerized printout and a descriptive analysis of an inventory of services in the voluntary sector provided by health, education, welfare, family service, legal service, employment, library and related human service agencies throughout Maryland; and (2) a descriptive

overview of the condition of services in the voluntary sector inclusive of individual and family life services and social and development services. The two activities were to be carried out simultaneously and the reports were due June 28, 1974.

The information for the study was obtained from two sources: (1) a telephone survey of voluntary agencies in Maryland and (2) an analysis of published and non-published information obtained from a sample of voluntary service agencies and funding bodies. Agencies contacted for the inventory of social services were listed in an updated version of the 1972 HWC Director of Community Services in Maryland. Each agency, prior to being contacted, received a letter explaining the purpose of the study and the questions that were to be asked.

In early June 1974, problems arose that necessitated the request by HWC for an extension beyond the June 28, 1974 completion date. Initial telephone contact with a sample of agencies demonstrated the existence of important difficulties relating to: (1) designation of agency liaison personnel competent to provide the necessary information; (2) requests for program specific information; and (3) requests for estimations of demographic and service data of the type included by DSP request in this survey.

On August 1, 1974, as part of the second requirement to provide a descriptive overview of services in the voluntary sector, the HWC delivered to the Department a draft copy of the report. The Department reviewed the report and returned it to the HWC on August 12, 1974 with the following major suggestions for revision: (1) increase the geographic coverage of the report to include the whole state, even though some of the data is not strictly compatible; (2) increase the scope and the range of the report to include the criminal justice and the health sectors; and (3) include sections on consumer concerns and service needs of previously defined subsectors.

Based on the DSP comments, the Health and Welfare Council spent several months revising the report and sent the Department a second draft in November. In January 1975, DSP staff returned the report with general comments on minor editorial problems and instruction on how to prepare the report for publication. The report, entitled Working Paper on Social Service Delivery in Maryland: An Overview of Programs, Problems and Priorities in the Voluntary Sector, was published in April 1975 and was widely distributed. Over 175 copies were sent to the Governor and Lt. Governor, the Secretaries of selected State departments and various human services program directors within those departments, the appropriate legislative committee chairmen and their members, HEW and HUD offices, city and county human services departments, the Planning Departments of two State Colleges, local libraries, and other states' planning departments who requested the report.

Although 453 voluntary agencies were contacted during the survey, only 165 agencies were selected for analysis. HWC decided to select two categories of service for analysis: (1) individual and family life services, and (2) social adjustment and social development services -- and only 165 agencies fell into the selected categories. However, information on the remaining 288 voluntary agencies was compiled and presented for comparative purposes.

Subject matter for analysis included eligibility criteria, program capacity, sources of funds, staff composition and demographic makeup of agency clientele. It revealed that there was a widespread absence of usable data and an unrelated mix of programs and program objectives. It was further determined that there was an absence of carefully formulated definitions of terms, tangible products, or explicit measures of output and demand. This resulted in difficulties in analyzing basic issues relating to the production, cost and supply of human services. In addition, other issues were highlighted which it was felt required

joint attention by the State and voluntary sectors: (1) the need for a better understanding of the effects of voluntary services; (2) the need for data necessary to determine the appropriate levels of reimbursement for purchased care; and (3) the need for a standardized method of accounting for that portion of a voluntary agency program which is publicly supported.

The scope of services also required a computerized printout which inventoried services in the voluntary sector. This printout, A Partial Inventory of Voluntary Service in Maryland, was completed and sent to the Department with a guide to the interpretation of the data on September 16, 1974. Information on all the 453 surveyed agencies was included in the inventory. Information was available for fourteen different UWASIS (United Way of America Services Identification System) categories and included four different program variables, i.e., personnel, sources of funds, groups served and ages served.

Since there was only one copy of the printout, the inventory was not distributed. However, State human service agencies were informed of its availability and were invited to use the information for their own planning activities.

After the distribution of the voluntary sector report, the Department received several congratulatory letters on this primary study of the voluntary sector. Respondents included a Department Secretary, a State Delegate, a Legislative Department, and several local governments.

The second year work program (FY 76) was submitted to HEW at the end of April 1975. Included in the work program was further analysis and refinement of the inventory of services in the voluntary sector. DSP expected to conduct an inhouse analysis of the HWC printout. The first step was to verify the printout information. The unedited Partial Inventory was analyzed by the staff and several problems were discovered such as non-comparability of certain

data, weaknesses in the categorizing of programs, and the imprecise definition of terms such as clientele, personnel and budgetary figures. In addition, the interpretation guide accompanying the printout did not indicate in sufficient detail the assumptions and methodology used to organize the information. Finally, the translation from UWASIS codes to DSP Activity Sector codes contained many inaccuracies. Due to these problems, there were reservations about the utilization of the inventory data.

At a joint meeting of the Department and the HWC in July 1975, it was decided that further editing and iterations of the Partial Inventory would be counterproductive. Information in the survey was now almost a year old and further analysis would probably require repeating the survey effort. Background material on the voluntary sector had been obtained and a decision was made that it would be most beneficial in the future for the Department to devote its attention to specific problems in service planning and delivery. It should also be pointed out that the Health and Welfare Council contract was not a large amount of money. DSP felt that the accomplishments which resulted from this small grant were considerable.

The purpose of this effort was to discover what types of service agencies comprise the voluntary sector and who were the clientele being served. This project provided the Department with this background in the form of an inventory of voluntary agencies and an overview of the system. This background material aided not only the Department, but also all those agencies who did planning in this sector.

The other major benefit of this project was the establishment of a working relationship between the Department of State Planning and the Health and Welfare Council. Regular meetings are held and each one informs the other of their project and their progress. This relationship is still strong today.

VIII. MANAGEMENT AND EVALUATION

The preceding Chapters have explained the history of the HSP&CP Project and described each of its major work elements. There is another important Project aspect which requires explanation--project management and administration. The HSP&CP was a three-year project with a total budget of \$684,760 (Federal Share - \$420,000, State - \$264,760). Administering a grant of this magnitude required sound project management.

The Human Resources Section consisted of functional planners in the areas of health, education, criminal justice, housing, manpower, social services, a generalist planner and a planner responsible for coordinating the Executive Planning Process. In addition, the Project Coordinator served as the social services planner. It is more accurate to view the DSP Human Resources Section as an inter-disciplinary team, rather than a group of individual planning specialists. Staff-to-staff communication on various interagency problems was an essential aspect of insuring that a comprehensive planning perspective was being provided.

Supervision was provided by the Director of Comprehensive Planning Division and the Chief of the Human Resources Section. It should be pointed out that both the Division Director and Section Chief had significant responsibilities in other areas and could not devote full time to HSP&CP supervision. According to the original HEW grant application, 15 percent of the Division Director's time and 20 percent of the Section Chief's time were allocated to the Project. Because of these limitations, a Project Coordinator was designated and was assigned the responsibility of day-to-day monitoring of the Project. Her duties included preparing monthly and annual progress reports, preparing the work program, handling routine correspondence and requests related to the HEW Project, insuring that Project activities were completed in a timely fashion, and overall Project coordination.

WORK PROGRAM, PROGRESS REPORTS, AND EVALUATION

Another important aspect of project administration was the preparation of formal reports such as the work program, progress reports and evaluations. For each of the three years of the HEW grant, a detailed work program has been prepared. The work program describes the previous year's progress and explains new work items planned for the next year. Each of the past year's accomplishments and problem areas are discussed with an eye towards learning what techniques or work products were successful and should be followed up on in the next year. The work program also describes those activities which should be dropped or modified for the next year. The work program presents an overall view of the Project and the relationship between major work elements and serves as a guide for the next year's work activities.

During the three years of the Partnership Grant, the Human Resources Section prepared two work programs, one for HUD funded activities and one for HEW activities. The HUD Overall Program Design (OPD) is the three-year operations plan which serves as a framework for the planning and management activities of the Department of State Planning. All activities of the Department, regardless of whether or not HUD funded, are discussed in the OPD. Departmental objectives are identified in the Design, annual program commitments are stated, staff requirements are defined, and the allocation of Federal and State fiscal resources are made.

The OPD is submitted to HUD as part of the Department's annual application for the "701" Comprehensive Planning Assistance Grant. The Department must submit a progress report after six months from the start of the grant on the progress of DSP in meeting its OPD objectives. On the completion of the grant, an Annual Program Report must be submitted which provides an evaluation of objectives and a statement of what activities were carried out to achieve the objectives.

The OPD and HEW work programs each used a distinct format. With the completion of the Partnership Grant funding, the Human Resources Section now prepares a single work program which incorporates the activities of the HEW work program but uses a format which conforms with the style used in the Department's OPD. The Human Resources Work Program will be included as part of the Overall Program Design. This means that the practice of monthly reports on the progress of human services activities and an annual evaluation report will continue.

During the year, regular monthly progress reports are prepared. Each staff member writes individual reports which are then compiled and organized by the Project Coordinator. The requirement to prepare monthly progress reports was an HEW condition for receipt of Partnership monies, and has proven so helpful that this practice will continue even though the grant period has ended. The monthly progress reports are a means of internally monitoring work activities and helping to determine whether or not commitments are being met. The readership of the progress reports has also increased. The reports are circulated to the staff, Departmental Secretary, Deputy Secretary, the Planning Commission and the Health and Welfare Council. Consideration is being given to expanding the audience to other public and private planning agencies which want to be kept informed about the DSP human service activities.

Staff meetings are another mechanism used to monitor Project progress. Staff meetings are not held on a regularly scheduled basis, but rather are held as needed. Sometimes meetings are held for a specific purpose, e.g., to develop the work program, review an issue paper or critique a work product. Other times meetings are just informational and provide an opportunity for Section members to explain their activities. At other times, outside resource people have been invited to address staff meetings.

In addition to monitoring activities, several internal and external evaluations have been conducted. At the end of each Project year, an in-house review and evaluation of past activities is undertaken by the staff. Major reports and work products are also assessed and evaluated. HEW central and regional office evaluations and outside consultant evaluations are the external evaluations.

The preparation of the annual work program provides the opportunity to evaluate past performance in order to determine which projects should be carried over into the next year. Generally, this evaluation is conducted during a lengthy staff meeting in which staff carefully assess the previous year's progress. Work activities which need to be changed or which require follow-up are identified. Activities which are completed and do not require any further follow-up are also noted. Staff also discuss problems relating to the Project which need to be addressed. For example, problems identified after the second year self-evaluation were:

- More timely completion of work products;
- Increased emphasis on implementation activities;
- Improving the visibility of the Human Resources Section as a separate unit within the Department capable of providing technical assistance and other services to user agencies.

These annual staff evaluation sessions have demonstrated their utility and this practice will also continue after funding ceases.

Evaluation of individual work items has occurred throughout the life of the Project. The primary focus of these activities has been a determination of the utility of the reports to the user community, the ways in which the information is applied to other planning activities, user assessments, and acceptance of recommendations. The evaluation of social indicators resulted in the decision by DSP not to update the report. Questionnaires which were distributed to all

participants in EPP seminars elicited a positive response from most respondents. An extensive user questionnaire has been prepared to test the utility of program inventory and to help point out needed changes.

Overall Project evaluations have been conducted by HEW and a private consulting firm. Annually, central HEW office staff conducted site visits. They reviewed previous Project activities with DSP staff and asked for a justification of the next year's proposed budget. Completed activities were explained at this time. The Central office also required a year-end report be prepared by DSP. This report included highlights of major work activities and successes, a copy of the work program, copies of the twelve monthly progress reports and copies of all completed work products. Year-end reports were prepared for all three Project years.

More frequent and informal evaluations were conducted by the regional HEW staff. Generally, some type of informal review occurred quarterly, and twice a year written evaluations were sent to DSP and the central office. These written evaluations were usually favorable. In the Spring of 1976, the regional staff monitor met with several human service agency representatives to assess the impact of the Project on other agencies. The results of these interviews were shared with DSP staff and were very helpful in suggesting new directions. Regional HEW evaluations were along the lines of monitoring the Project to see that grant conditions and objectives were being met.

In the Fall of 1976, HEW awarded a contract to a consulting firm for the purpose of evaluating the Partnership Program throughout the country. HEW was interested in learning about successful approaches to human services planning that could be shared among grantees, other planning bodies, and interested State and local jurisdictions. Also of interest to HEW was an evaluation of the administration of the Partnership Grants Program, including recommendations for strengthening HEW-grantee relationships. Maryland was one of 19 grantees selected as a case study for an in-depth review.

Interviews by the consultant were conducted with planners in the major human service delivery agencies in the State, members of the Governor's staff, representatives from the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning, and members of the original Human Services Task Force. The consultant also spent considerable time with the HSP&CP Project Coordinator, the Director of the Comprehensive Planning Division, and the EPP coordinator. Monthly activities reports and staff reports and studies were also reviewed. The first version of the consultant's case study was presented to DSP in July 1977.

A set of detailed comments was sent to the consultant and a meeting then followed between the consultant and selected DSP staff. In preparation of those comments, the staff took the opportunity to carefully review the Project's developmental history, its accomplishments and outcomes, and its expected impact. This process served as a valuable internal evaluation which, in turn, benefited the design and focus of this case study. Staff comments helped to shape the revised version of the case study.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Overall, the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project was effectively managed. However, through experience in completing its various work elements, several valuable lessons were learned about improving project management. These lessons were helpful and should be shared with other Partnership grantees. These lessons clustered around the areas of managing staff and consultants, managing large work products and increasing the effective utilization of reports and studies.

It was found that the supervisory structure of the Human Resources Section and the Project's internal management worked well for day-to-day operations, but these systems required adaptation for completing major work products. Several

significant work elements, such as social indicators, program inventory, and issue papers, reappeared in successive work programs because they were not completed. The primary reason for this was that these projects were too large and complex for a single person to manage. Projects which required input from other staff members or required negotiations with and review of consultants' work, or projects which resulted in 200-page documents required constant monitoring.

During the two years of preparing the Social Indicator Report, the HSP&CP Coordinator had come to rely on other staff members who were knowledgeable in data and statistics to help guide the report. Gradually, these staff members assumed more responsibility for the report's development and were considered the project managers for social indicators by other section staff.

Staff were also concerned about the long delay in completing the Program Inventory Report. It was apparent that the assumption of project management responsibility by other staff members for social indicators had served to speed that report's preparation. Therefore, it was decided to adopt a similar project manager system for completing program inventory. The health planner assumed this responsibility and then requested a co-manager be designated due to the large volume of data and detail involved in this report.

This project manager system is now utilized extensively and will continue to be used in future work activities of the Section now that the Partnership Grant has ended. A specific Human Resources staff member is assigned primary responsibility for each activity in the work program, even though the activity may require input from some or all of the Section staff members. The HSP&CP Coordinator still serves as a useful and needed role in providing day-to-day monitoring and overall coordination of Sectional activities.

The Human Resources Section was one of the largest staffs funded by Partnership monies. With a Project staff of eight full time functional planners, plus

short term contractual personnel, it was reasonable to expect some staff turnover. Several issue papers, e.g. Transportation Disadvantaged, Education-to-Work Linkages, experienced delays due to staff changes. One way found to minimize disruptions caused by staff turnover was to designate co-managers for large scale projects. Thus, continuity was maintained despite staffing changes.

There was a definite advantage in developing an interdisciplinary staff. As previously stated, the team approach used by HSP&CP staff facilitated inter-agency coordination since staff were able to view projects from a comprehensive planning perspective. The interdisciplinary focus of the Human Resources Section also helped to minimize the effects of staff turnover. There was usually at least one other staff person familiar with the duties and responsibilities of departing staff, who would be able to fill in, at least temporarily, until a replacement was hired.

HEW funds allowed State Planning to augment staff resources by hiring contractual employees and private consultants. Difficulties were encountered in social indicators, program inventory, the guide book for local planning, and other work activities in using consultants. The lack of timely completion of work products was one of the more serious problems. Through the course of the Project, several methods were developed to help counter this:

- (1) Development of specific contracts or scope of services helped to clearly define the tasks to be completed by the consultant. The multiple party contract developed for the Cecil County planner is an example of a very specific contract which was valuable for project monitoring and financial management.
- (2) It was helpful to require regular progress reports from consultants. For large scale projects such as social indicators, required interim reports were found useful.

- (3) If work is proceeding too slowly or is not of satisfactory quality, contracts should be terminated. Hesitancy to terminate may mean that additional burdens such as editing or major rewriting will be placed on existing staff. This contradicts the purpose of hiring contractual staff, which is to augment permanent staff resources or skills.

A second major management issue associated with the Project related to the production of major work products. Program inventory and social indicators consumed considerable staff time and took over two years to produce. In order for these reports to be useful, they had to be comprehensive. It might have been wiser to produce these reports in stages or to release a series of smaller reports. The Transportation Disadvantaged and Purchase of Care issue papers started out as very extensive reports, but were later scaled down. The decision to narrow their scope and reduce the topic selected made these projects much more manageable.

The study of target group agencies also was reduced in scope. Concern was raised that busy legislators and executive policy makers would not have the time to read the entire study. In order to avoid having the study become a "book shelf" document, the study was summarized and reduced from over 50 pages to eight. If readers needed more detailed information, the full version of the study was made available.

Another lesson learned as the result of lengthy preparation of issue papers was the need for detailed outlines and work agendas. The contractual planner who prepared Deinstitutionalization: Problems and Opportunities developed an explicit and detailed outline for the paper and a schedule of necessary work tasks and a timetable for their completion. Periodic reports were submitted describing work progress and accomplishments and also problems and setbacks. This system provided accountability and eased project monitoring. More import-

antly, the preparation of this detailed work agenda enabled other DSP staff members to complete the study after her departure. It is also valuable to note that as a consultant, this person experienced the privilege of working on this one assignment and could commit all of her time and attention to it.

Ways to increase the readability and utility of large scale studies and reports was the last area where improved management was desirable. Through evaluations of the social indicators and program inventory reports, it was found that additional training was necessary. No matter how clearly the text explains the advantages of a report or its limitations, this may become lost in long reports. The development of training packages to accompany reports would increase their effective utilization by other planners. Feedback gained through such training sessions would also aid the Human Resources Section in later evaluation efforts.

The lack of timely completion of work products was not restricted to only those activities contracted to outside consultants. Delays in final publication were a problem effecting all the issue papers and program inventory. Some of the delays were due to the extensive internal and external review process which was required of published documents. Review and comment provides an opportunity for input of other viewpoints and helps build support for a report. However, in some cases, DSP might have benefited by sacrificing some of the reports' accuracy for the sake of more timely publication. There can obviously be extremes of either condition, so it is necessary to carefully weight the inherent trade-offs in determining timeliness vs. accuracy. This problem was demonstrated in the different review approaches used for the deinstitutionalization study and the program inventory report. Great care was taken in the deinstitutionalization study to insure that all interviewees and resource persons agreed with the report's contents. Because of this, the review process was quite lengthy.

This was not the case with the program inventory effort. The Program Inventory was a very detailed report and contained numerous charts, tables and matrices. Although the data tables were carefully checked by DSP staff, it was recognized that some errors would remain. However, rather than delay publication of the report to allow for outside review, it was decided to distribute the inventory and correct the errors in future updates.

Work Activities Not Completed

The goals and work elements of the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project were extremely ambitious and it is not surprising that some activities were not completed. However, the number of uncompleted activities (6 work items) is very small compared to the large number of completed activities. There are a variety of reasons to explain these uncompleted activities.

The reason for producing an issue paper on information and referral and a study on interagency coordination in community home care study diminished considerably between the time topics were selected and the time staff began to prepare them. The work program schedules activities throughout the year since all activities cannot be conducted at once. When staff were able to begin work on the information and referral and community home care studies, they were no longer issues of critical importance, and did not meet the selection criteria that the topic be of concern. Therefore, it was decided not to expand staff resources to complete the studies.

Two work items were produced but were never distributed outside the Department. After the first draft of a nursing home study, it was clear that the paper required extensive revisions. Since the study had already met its primary objective--to provide in-house information on State nursing home care--final revisions were not made. The housing sector conditions and trends paper was also prepared in draft form, but a final copy was not completed. Information

in this draft paper was used in the Housing Element recently prepared by the Department for HUD.

The work item calling for small area demographic estimates and projections was predicated on the requests from local planning agencies to produce this data. After several meetings with local representatives, it was determined that it would be impossible to develop a format which would be acceptable to all jurisdictions. For example, some areas needed estimates by transportation planning districts, some by water and sewer districts, and others by subcounty or subcensus tract areas. It was determined that this activity was beyond the scope of responsibility of the Human Resources Section, and this work item was reassigned to DSP's Research Division.

Another factor explaining why activities were not always completed was that staff resources were not always adequate. This was the case for the human services planning seminar. Considerable work and organization would be required to stage a planning conference for 100 participants.

Relationship with Health, Education and Welfare

The relationship between State Planning and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare did not consist of just evaluations and site visits. Rather, over the course of the Project, both DSP and HEW benefited from the association. It is easiest to discuss the relationship with HEW in terms of central and regional offices.

As discussed in Chapter III, an HEW regional representative had been involved in DSP's efforts to develop a human resources plan prior to HEW funding. The representative from HEW took an active role in the human resources advisory group. He maintained a high level of interest in and was supportive of Maryland's concept of a State human resources plan and companion planning process. It was this regional representative who first discussed the possible availability of

HEW funds to support the Maryland project. During the course of the following year, a number of meetings were held and correspondence continued between DSP and the HEW regional office towards the eventual application in 1974 for a Partnership Grant. Although this application was forwarded to the central HEW office in Washington and the award and actual financial determination was made by this office, the regional office acted in a supportive liaison capacity throughout this process.

The Maryland Project was awarded funds in 1974 and was assigned to the Office of Planning and Evaluation in the Office of the Regional Director (Philadelphia) for purposes of project and financial monitoring. Maryland's was the only Partnership Project funded in the region that year, and because of its clear planning and coordination emphasis within State government, the decision was made to place it within the Planning and Evaluation Unit. All subsequent Partnership Projects in the region were assigned to the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs (IGA). This situation enabled the Maryland Project to receive probably more of a share of HEW's attention than other projects in the region monitored by IGA.

The role of the regional monitors for the HSP&CP can best be described as advisory and consultative. They regularly received copies of monthly staff activities reports. In some instances, they received preliminary copies of staff studies or reports and offered comments on these documents. More often, however, they received final copies of reports. They forwarded detailed comments on the social indicators report, but on all other reports they simply acknowledged receipt. The monitors were also helpful when second and third year funding applications needed to be prepared. They reviewed draft applications, offered direct and specific guidelines, and advocated on the Department's behalf with officials in Washington. In addition to assisting on the funding applications, the regional

monitors reviewed the Human Resource Section work programs and helped to shape these into meaningful work guides.

The regional monitors were required to submit quarterly evaluation reports on the HSP&CP to officials in HEW's central office in Washington. These were prepared based on the Human Resources Section's monthly progress reports and on site visits to DSP that the monitors conducted. Mid-way in the second year of the HSP&CP, the Project monitor conducted interviews with State and local agency representatives, members of the Human Resources Task Force and other people who had familiarity with the HSP&CP, to obtain their opinions about the Project. The results of his assessment were generally encouraging to DSP. The monitor met with DSP staff and in a very helpful manner, pointed to work areas or relationships that could be strengthened.

While the regional monitors were helpful to DSP in many ways, the relationship was far from one-sided. The Department of State Planning was asked by the regional office to review and prepare comments on a variety of topics. Annually, DSP assisted in the selection of regional issue papers by the preparation of comments and an ordering of topics by priority concern. Staff also reviewed regional reports and responded to questionnaires (often designed by the central office of HEW) that were forwarded to the Department. The regional monitors used DSP as a contact point or liaison to other units of Maryland State government.

The Department of State Planning's relationship with the central office of HEW is best described as formal. In most areas, they chose to use the regional office as an intermediary between themselves and grantees. The central office conducted thorough evaluations of the HSP&CP, sending several key program officials to DSP to meet the Division and Section heads, Project Coordinator, and appropriate staff at the end of each fiscal year, in an effort to review past

activities and help determine the appropriate funding level for the project in the next year.

The central office conducted a number of informational conferences for Partnership Grantees. DSP attended these conferences and for the most part, found them valuable opportunities for grantees to meet and share their successes, failures, problems and solutions, etc. DSP staff found these aspects of the conferences to be of greater value than the formal presentations and conference activities that HEW designed. The Department also assisted HEW by arranging several workshop sessions to discuss HEW budget priorities.

Information Sharing and Dissemination

One of the goals of the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project was to share information about the Project in order to demonstrate the potential for transfer of successful work activities to other future Partnership Grantees and to other human service planning agencies. Methods to inform the general public about the Project include presentations to the State Planning Commission, presentations to the State Legislative Committees (including the annual budget presentation), articles in the DSP Newsletter and Annual Report, attendance at conferences, and through Project SHARE.

Staff also responded to individual requests for specific information. Several other states have learned about the HSP&CP through Project SHARE or through conferences and have requested further information. Staff have also responded to requests from universities and colleges regarding the planning and policy aspects of the Project. Invitations to address meetings or serve on panels are becoming more frequent. For example, recently DSP staff have given speeches at a conference on coordination sponsored by the Division of Community Education, Maryland Department of Education; a meeting of the Governor's

Commission on Children and Youth; the Howard County Community Education Task Force; and the 4-C Committee. Staff also addressed a seminar at a major university.

IX. ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND LESSONS

The Human Services Planning and Coordination Project (HSP&CP) was an intensive effort to improve the planning and management of human services in Maryland. Its focus was comprehensive in nature; that is, it sought to improve the capabilities of individual service delivery agencies to do better planning, while also stressing the interrelatedness of the planning and management efforts of these agencies within the total service system. In working towards these goals, the Human Resources staff of the Department of State Planning (DSP) experienced many successes and were able to recognize significant movement towards the direction of improved comprehensive planning.

PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Success of the HSP&CP must be viewed through two different but related perspectives. The first reviews and considers the tangible accomplishments of the Human Resources staff within the Partnership Grant period. This perspective focuses on the production, distribution and utilization of issue papers and special reports, such as program inventory or social indicators. It must be kept in mind that these efforts were designed first and foremost to assist State planners, managers and other decision-makers. As was discussed many times throughout this case study, these efforts were designed and carried out in consultation with State agencies to help assure their utility. The second way of judging the success of the Project is to assess the growth or movement towards improved, coordinated human services planning at the State and local levels that has come about through various work activities of the Project. This can be viewed in light of the variety of interagency planning efforts that have taken place within the Project's three years. It is valuable to review these efforts towards coordination and to make a judgement about their long-range effects. These

measures of success are more subjective and, therefore, more difficult to gauge, but it is important to recognize whether such changes would have occurred without the impetus of the HSP&CP. In almost all instances the unequivocal answer is that the Project took an active and lead role and was instrumental in bringing about significant institutional reform in comprehensive human services planning.

Outcomes and accomplishments of the HSP&CP can be most clearly understood when grouped under the three major headings of the work program. These headings are: coordination activities, planning and technical assistance, and the analysis of needs and conditions. Coordination activities were geared toward the more efficient utilization of both staff and financial resources within human resource agencies. Their explicit purposes were the elimination of duplicative efforts and the promotion of harmonious working relationships among those agencies providing similar or related services. The coordination activities of the Human Resources Section throughout the Project led to an ever-increasing awareness of and sensitivity to the value of interagency planning among the human service provider agencies. Appreciation for the role of interagency coordination in problem-solving and issue-resolution was enhanced, and, therefore, improved working relationships among several key agencies developed. An example is the Interagency Committee for the Planning and Budgeting of Aged Services (chaired by the Office on Aging with representatives from DHR, DHMH and DSP); this Committee has worked diligently towards coordinated budget requests to the Secretaries of the three aforementioned service delivery agencies. Their recognition of the need for and value of coordinated planning was facilitated by the Human Resources Section's reviews of these Departments' Executive Plans and subsequent meetings with these three agencies.

The Human Resources Section of the Department of State Planning has developed an inter-disciplinary team of staff members with various functional specialties who work together to ensure the comprehensiveness and inter-relatedness of responses to State human resources concerns. This staff works closely together, recognizing each other's areas of expertise. For example, as the housing and community development planner works with the Office on Aging on sheltered housing, he consults with the social services planner and the health planner to assure that these other areas of need of the elderly are considered in developmental aspects of this program. This is also true in other programming areas that require an inter-disciplinary approach, such as meeting the needs of handicapped children. The coordination among staff members has been an integral part of the success of the HSP&CP. It has also helped to assure the comprehensiveness of all work activities of the Project, especially issue papers which specifically address areas of inter-agency concern.

Participation by the Human Resources staff on a wide variety of inter-agency planning and coordinative groups provides an early opportunity to detect program gaps or duplications. Staff are frequently able to identify areas in need of possible policy clarifications in advance of service delivery agencies because of their participation on these interagency committees. Examples of staff ability to recognize these areas of ambiguity include special issue papers on the roles of target groups in State government and differing rates paid to residential facilities for adolescents. These papers were prepared at the initiative of staff and have been extremely valuable to the Legislature, the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning and the Governor's Office. This identification helps to assure resolution in the policy formulation stage, i.e., the staff's participation on the Governor's Commission on Funding for the Handicapped (The Schifter Commission) enables them to observe the coordinated program planning

of the Departments of Human Resources, Education and Health and Mental Hygiene to meet the needs of handicapped children, and to assist in the most efficient utilization of resources. As another example, reviews of the Executive Plans of major State agencies alerts staff to services or programs being developed for the future. Where such programs should be coordinated with other agencies or where these programs might duplicate existing services of another agency, staff work with all appropriate agency planners and staff to assure program complementarity.

Many outcomes related to planning and technical assistance can be outlined. Most of these relate to the greatly improved quality of human services planning, both of line agencies and the Department of State Planning. The Human Resources staff's ability to provide meaningful planning guidance has improved, and the willingness of agencies to accept this assistance has been enhanced. This is especially evident when the quality of Executive Plans is reviewed; substantive plan reviews have been responsible for vast improvements over the last four years of this planning process.

It is also important to recognize an increased awareness of human services planning and concerns among physical planners (both within the Division of Comprehensive Planning and the major State agencies) in such areas as transportation, land use, sewer/water quality, recreation, etc. The relatedness of physical and social planning had previously not been clearly understood. Activities of the State often reflected this misunderstanding. There now exists a significant integration of physical and social planning within the State. This is best illustrated by the attention paid in the State Land Use Plan to concerns such as housing, employment opportunities, and demands for public services.

A network of valuable resource persons who address human resource planning matters has developed throughout the life of the Project. (The Human Services

Task Force and other contact persons are primarily referenced here.) The relationship with these key persons is mutually beneficial. It is quite common for human resources staff to receive calls for information or assistance from original Task Force members or from staff in the human service agencies. In a like manner, staff frequently contact these same people as issue papers are developed and as legislation is reviewed. Interagency planning committees and work on other activities also requires close contacts with these liaisons.

Reports on topics of interagency concern with an objective and comprehensive perspective have been produced as a result of planning and technical assistance efforts. Staff selected topics in areas where problems were recognized and where resolution is needed (purchase of care, target groups). Staff also responded to the requests of the Legislature and the Human Services Task Force (deinstitutionalization, coordination of human services). This has led to an increased awareness of the value of human services planning and inter-agency coordination by the Legislature and the Governor's Office. The Department's neutrality as an "objective" agency with no turf to defend plus the staff's expertise in human services planning are reasons for requests for development of papers, participation on task forces, and the like.

Significant strides have been made in the developmental aspects of the Executive Planning Process: increased sophistication in planning and management in State agencies via the Guidance Manual, specialized training courses, extensive Plan reviews, and meetings with agency planners and managers have all taken place in the three years of the Project. A pilot Annual Executive Plan Report was prepared last year for the Legislature; it highlights the major trends and directions of the educational agencies' plans. This activity is clearly related to the planning and technical assistance that staff provide to the major State agencies submitting Executive Plans.

The placement of a planner in the Department of Human Resources has improved the planning capacity of that agency and has strengthened the ties between DSP and DHR. The planner has strived for the integration of the various planning requirements that are imposed upon DHR and has also provided technical assistance to the Cecil County planning project. In that way, the work of the Cecil County Task Force can be utilized as a model for local input to the Title XX planning effort. It also helps to assure that Cecil County's work is recognized by the Title XX planning effort, so that their needs assessment activities may have an impact on the distributional formula for individual jurisdictions.

Prior to the Project, there was very little attention paid to the problems counties were experiencing in human services planning. Through the Cecil County local planning project, both State Planning and the Department of Human Resources have become increasingly sensitive to the particular needs of localities in initiating and sustaining a comprehensive human resources planning process. State Planning has prepared a "Handbook for Local Human Resources Planning" and is committed to providing training in this subject for interested jurisdictions. The Department of Human Resources, which has also provided ongoing technical assistance to Cecil County, is interested in the model being developed there regarding a local needs assessment methodology. That methodology would then be tested in other jurisdictions during the Title XX planning process. The Cecil County experience has also tested and proven new models of State-local cooperation -- truly effecting a "working" partnership.

Another example of State-local cooperation is evidenced by the working relationship Human Resources staff have developed with the Baltimore City Planning Department. After transferring a portion of its Partnership Grant to that Department to develop a series of planning papers in the first year of the Project, the Department of State Planning is now working with the Department of

Human Resources for the purpose of resolving data problems so that DSP may possibly provide a Statewide test of this locally-designed day care model. During that contract period with Baltimore City, four other reports were prepared, dealing essentially with health and day care related issues.

Increased attention to the planning process of local governments and regional planning organizations by the State is evident in a number of areas. Staff have devoted significant energies to assisting the Regional Planning Council as they developed their General Development Plan. They have also assisted Montgomery County's Office of Human Resources in their work in social indicators and resource allocation. Staff have acted as facilitators to link Montgomery County's Office of Human Resources, Baltimore City's Planning Department, and the Health and Welfare Council on the issue of services classification systems, and Cecil, Kent and Howard Counties on the processes of human resources planning.

Activities in the area of the analysis of needs and conditions were primarily designed to provide a data base for coordinated human services planning. These activities probably represented the Department's largest venture into uncharted waters. Clearly, work in the areas of social indicators and program inventory was novel for the State, and these efforts were not initially met with resounding acceptance. However, the sophistication of human resources planning has increased through the work the Department has initiated towards the development of a unified data base for planning. This includes both the social indicators project and the program inventory report. The value of the program inventory has been recognized by a member of the Senate Finance Committee, who has stated that this report is used extensively by that Committee. Staff have also developed the ability to thoroughly evaluate these efforts, to review their utility and assess the value of further iterations of such efforts.

An enhanced relationship with the Health and Welfare Council has provided the State with a unique perspective of the voluntary sector service network. The last year, especially, has seen marked increase in the level of cooperation between DSP and HWC. These agencies regularly have joint staff meetings and also meet to discuss the comparability and utilization problems/successes of services classification systems developed by each agency.

Several Project outcomes fall outside of any of the three major work headings of the HSP&CP. These are discussed in terms of the general and overall impact of the Project. Since the "pre-Partnership" days, there has grown a considerably improved State-Federal relationship. The Human Resources Section is now regularly requested to review draft documents and reports and to respond to questionnaires and surveys from HEW. This relationship has every reason to continue past the receipt of Federal funds.

LESSONS

Upon the conclusion of the HSP&CP, the Human Resources Section staff have been able to reflect upon several lessons that can be shared with other Partnership Grantees or interested jurisdictions. These "lessons" are broad and generic in nature, being built upon all of the Project's activities rather than any specific product or effort. The Maryland Project found the definition of objectives by HEW for its Partnership Programs to be vague and non-specific. The objective of "improving the capacity of the chief elected official to better plan, manage, and deliver human services" is an objective that nearly defies evaluation. The HSP&CP was built upon the assumption that if individual agencies' planning capacities were improved and there was a greater and more meaningful level of coordination between and among human service agencies, then the overall level of human services

planning in the State would improve. Accomplishment of these two tasks was seen as equivalent to meeting HEW's Partnership objective.

In order to meet the non-specific objective of "capacity building," the HSP&CP was broadly defined. Its work programs ranged from specific activities such as the production of an issue paper on a single topic to more general efforts such as participation on interagency committees. This caused the Project to refocus its energies and modify its work programs so that the reality of staff and financial resources could be better reflected. The Project's reach often exceeded its grasp. Advice to other grantees would center on the advantages of starting small and more limited in focus, and then branching out into other activities when a level of credibility and a proven track record have been attained. This is one tenet that DSP would likely follow if it were to begin another Project like that funded by HEW.

A strategy for building Project support is to develop credibility with the decision makers in human service providers agencies and departments. They, in turn, would demonstrate their support of human service planning and coordination activities. The Human Services Task Force was the vehicle for generating agency support. Since most Task Force members were program managers, it was found that the goals and objectives of the Human Services Planning and Coordination Project were not always translated up to the agencies' top policy makers.

The notion of a major State planning initiative such as the HSP&CP was likely seen as a potential challenge to the organizational equilibrium of State government, and it is not difficult to understand why State Planning's efforts may have been viewed with suspicion. Prior to the initiation of the Project, few service delivery agencies were aware of the need for greater service coordination. Thus, many human service planners and managers saw the Project as a threat to the current delivery system.

The Project devoted concentrated attention on consensus building during its developmental stages. This was necessary to overcome line agencies' possible reluctance to becoming fully involved in the comprehensive planning effort. Given the relatively short time frame of the Partnership Grants (three years), the decision to invest a large amount of time into building support for a Project can be a difficult one. Doesn't it appear safer to simply move quickly into work activities and strive for some identifiable and credible products? That is a difficult question to answer and its resolution lies in some trade-offs between the two. The Human Resources Section staff attempted to satisfy both these equally important stages and feel that they were successful. The pattern appeared somewhat cyclical after a short period of time; that is, Project support came when work products were produced and the HSP&CP was able to ride on its own credits. It is also important to recall that while the actual funding period of Partnership Projects is short, if projects are successful, they will be carried past that time frame. When viewed with this longer-range perspective, it is easier to see the value of consensus or support building in the early stages of projects.

While consensus building is seen as a necessary first step to any Partnership Project, the value of tangible work products cannot be overlooked. This "process-product" dichotomy has probably plagued every grantee at some time during its life; it was successfully overcome by the HSP&CP through diligent efforts to institutionalize a coordinated human services planning process while also producing special papers and data-base reports that helped to attain this goal. Projects may strive for developing or improving a coordination process (for the purpose of creating a comprehensive human service system), and that is a desirable activity. The drawback to that approach, however, is that the outcomes of such a process are often difficult to document or quantify. Lacking such evidence of productivity or accomplishment, a chief executive or legislature

would likely find it difficult to refund the project in years subsequent to HEW funding. Products must be produced that can be of significant value to the major policy or decision makers within a project's jurisdiction, if any credence is to be given to a project. Developing tangible work products is also clear because it enables a project to be identified by any new personnel that may result from changes in executive leadership or normal staff turnover. In the absence of products, a project is totally dependent upon personal relationships--which are at best, temporal.

Staff of the Human Resources Section have also recognized the importance of maintaining a realistic perspective when working on any major planning initiative. Major change within bureaucratic organizations takes a great deal of time; it is certainly not to be expected within the three years of Partnership Projects. Planning staff need to be cognizant of the operating constraints that are imposed upon functional or service delivery agencies and must be aware of the realities of these constraints. Parallel to a sensitivity to the bureaucratic environment, project staff should attempt to work in a style that is consistent with that of the chief elected official or the jurisdiction. When it became apparent that the concept of the Human Services Council was not going to be approved by the Governor, the Human Resources Section concentrated attention on committees and interagency planning activities. Pursuing activities that are in conflict with the managerial "style" of the chief elected official or out of line with directions taken by the major legislative body is a futile waste of time for project personnel. Clearly, this is an area where attention to consensus building must be paid.

The reality of instituting a new process within a governmental organization can be difficult and time-consuming. Probably the most important factor of the HSP&CP was the staff and the Project's ability to remain flexible to the needs of many actors--including planners and managers in functional agencies, the Legisla-

ture and the Governor. It was this flexibility that helped to ultimately assure the success of the Project. A final testimony to that success is the fact that all of the staff positions within the Human Resources Section have been retained. The Project has successfully institutionalized its planning effort, based on the value of the work completed during the three short years of its life. The Section's work program for the first year after the Partnership Grant period reflects continued involvement in interagency coordination and planning groups, the provision of technical assistance to State and local agencies, and the preparation of a variety of issue papers.

DO NOT CIRCULATE

DO NOT CIRCULATE

DO NOT CIRCULATE

UNIV. OF MD. COLLEGE PARK



3 1430 00294412 4

HECKMAN
BINDERY INC.



MAY 85

N. MANCHESTER,
INDIANA 46962

